NOVA EUROPA

EUROPEAN SURVIVAL STRATEGY IN A DARKENING WORLD

ARTHUR KEMP

Given current demographic trends, European people will first become an outright minority in their own lands within the next thirty years. Thereafter, they will become a tiny minority, and shortly after that, will vanish completely under a flood of further immigration and miscegenation.

"Traditional" political activity has failed to stem the tide, and the time has come to consider an alternative strategy which will preserve Europeans in the post-Western age. This book describes the steps required to attain a practical solution, namely a European ethnostate, divorced from "white supremacy" over others.

Drawing upon history and two practical examples (the Afrikaner town of Orania and the Zionist state of Israel), the author forms an coherent argument for the creation of, at first, local European communities, and then eventually, the creation of a European ethnostate arising from the chaos of a Third Worldized globe. It includes detailed steps and territorial proposals.

It is a positive, practical, answer to the crisis facing European man and which, if implemented, might provide his only salvation.

Why is it that only the European people are under threat in this way? What is different about the other peoples of the earth, that they are not under threat of extinction in this manner?

The answer is simple, and obvious: it is because all the other people of the earth have homelands, or heartlands, where they can maintain their racial integrity and identity, no matter what else happens elsewhere in the world. No matter how much the miscegenation process continues elsewhere, China will always be Chinese. Japan will always be Japanese. Africa will always be African. Why therefore, is there no European heartland, in which European people are a majority, and in which they have the inalienable right to maintain their racial identity and integrity? European people need a heartland, a homeland, just like any other people on earth.

Ostara Publications
ostarapublications.com

ISBN 978-1-291-26360-2
90000

NOVA EUROPA

EUROPEAN SURVIVAL STRATEGY IN A DARKENING WORLD

BY ARTHUR KEMP

OSTARA PUBLICATIONS

WWW.OSTARAPUBLICATIONS.COM

ISBN 978-1-291-26360-2

Contents

Introduction....................1

Chapter One: The Premise....................3

Chapter Two: The Historical Background and the Current Reality....................16

Chapter 3: Can Europeans Survive?....................25

Chapter Four: Moral, Legal, and Historical Justification for a European Homeland....................34

Chapter 5: Case Study 1—Orania....................42

Chapter 6: Case Study 2—Zionism and the State of Israel....................52

Chapter 7: The Plan and Its Implementation....................64

Chapter 8: The Territory....................74

Chapter 9: Conclusion....................80

COLVMBVS ANTIPODVM PRIMVS
ORBEM

Dedicated to Christopher Columbus, who dared to cross the sea.

Introduction

THIS book is directed at a very specific target audience. If any reader has picked it up wondering to him or herself "why" there should be a European survival strategy at all, then it is best to probably put it down straightaway without reading any further.

This work is meant for those people of goodwill who can see, understand, and support the idea that it is worthwhile to preserve racial diversity on earth.

Furthermore, it is directed to those people who can see and understand that, of all the different races on earth, only the European people are facing imminent extinction.

The liberal establishment likes to talk about the "mass movement of peoples" as some sort of modern universal phenomena, as if it is happening everywhere to everyone.

Yet those observers who are honest, will concede that this "mass movement" of people is exclusively one way: from nonwhite countries to white countries.

This flow was a trickle in the first two decades following the end of the Second World War, but has, in the last twenty or thirty years, turned into a veritable tidal wave.

Current demographic trends have already turned Europeans into minorities in all major cities of the US, and increasing numbers of major cities in western Europe. This trend is speeding up exponentially.

Simply put, the European people are being racially displaced from their traditional heartlands through mass Third World immigration.

It is ONLY happening in the First World. The populations of the Third World are completely unaffected by this "mass migration of peoples."

The European people are the ONLY ones who are threatened with extinction through this process.

There is no danger that the Indian people are going to disappear.

There is no danger that the African people are going to disappear.

There is no danger that the Chinese people are going to disappear.

There is no danger that any of the other races of people on earth are going to disappear—except the European people.

Given current demographic trends, European people will first become an outright minority in their own lands within the next thirty years. Thereafter, they will become a tiny minority, and shortly after that, will vanish completely under a flood of further immigration and miscegenation.

Why is it that only the European people are under threat in this way?

What is different about the other peoples of the earth, that they are not under threat of extinction in this manner?

The answer is simple, and obvious: it is because all the other people of the earth have homelands, or heartlands, where they can maintain their racial integrity and identity, no matter what else happens elsewhere in the world.

No matter how much the miscegenation process continues elsewhere, China will always be Chinese.

Japan will always be Japanese.

Africa will always be African.

Why therefore, is there no European heartland, in which European people are a majority, and in which they have the inalienable right to maintain their racial identity and integrity?

It is to those people who can see this impending crisis, that this book is addressed.

European people need a heartland, a homeland, just like any other people on earth.

It is to this end, that the Nova Europa project is dedicated.

Arthur Kemp
February 2013

Chapter One:
The Premise

ALL nations, peoples, and cultures have an absolute right to existence. The incredible human diversity which we see on the earth is the product of thousands and thousands of years of development. Each culture, each people, have developed according to their own standards and norms, and have created unique and distinct civilizations which are a reflection of themselves.

No one has the right to deny any other individual, people, race, or culture, the right to be who they are, and to maintain their distinct identity. The European people have a right to existence, just like any other people on earth.

This is not some wild, irrational, or "extreme" statement.

No one would question the right of the Chinese people to their continued existence as a distinct racial group.

No one would question the right of the Japanese people to their continued existence as a distinct racial group.

No one would question the right of the African people to their continued existence as a distinct racial group.

Therefore, it is logical that no one should question the right of the European people to their existence as a distinct racial group.

Strangely enough however, some people do just that. A small number do it in a distinctively negative sense—suggesting that it is "revenge" for "colonization" or other perceived historical wrongs—but most do it in an indirect way, through their negative reaction to anyone who dares to suggest that European racial survival is as important as the right to survival of the aborigine people of Australia, or the Indian tribes in the Amazon.

This is, of course, an utterly incorrect perception. Correcting it is vital to the premise that European survival is not only desirable, but vital to maintaining human diversity.

It is ironic that those who seek to blend and destroy individual racial identities are the biggest enemies of diversity, while simultaneously claiming to support diversity. The end result of that form of diversity is the exact opposite of their stated goal: the destruction of individual identities and ultimately, the destruction of diversity.

It is to this end, the preservation of diversity and identity, including that of the European people, that this work is intended.

Race Is Reality

There is nothing shameful or "furtive" in talking about race. People do it all the time and think nothing of it.

For example, if someone in a crowded room said: "Look, a Chinese man has entered the room," everyone would expect to see a person who looks like Mao Tse Tung or Jackie Chan.

No one would expect to see a black man, or a white man. In other words, people associate "Chinese person" with a definable and distinct physical appearance: a race.

Similarly, if someone in a crowded room said: "Look, an African has entered the room," everyone would expect to see a person who looked like Idi Amin or Jesse Jackson.

No one would expect to see a Chinese person, or an Indian—or a European.

If someone in a crowded room said: "Look, there is an Indian man entering the room," everyone would expect to see someone who looked either like Ghandi, or Hiawatha.

No one would expect to see a Japanese person, or a Chinese person, or for that matter, a European or an African.

All of these immediate assumptions are explicitly racial in context. That is taken as a given: A Chinese person looks Chinese; a Japanese person looks Japanese; an Indian person looks Indian, and so on and so forth.

This can all be said without anyone raising an eyebrow. It is accepted, a given.

And not one part of it is taken with any degree of opprobrium, racial supremacy, or denigration, and rightly so. Yet, somehow, as soon as the word "European", or, even worse, "white" is injected into it, the context is immediately taken differently. There is, of course, no justification for this change of contextualization.

If it is perfectly fine to expect a Chinese person to look Chinese, if it is perfectly acceptable to expect an Indian person to look Indian, and perfectly acceptable for an African person to look African, then it is perfectly acceptable for a European person to look European.

Anything less is simply anti-white racism.

What the Modern World Owes European Man

Europe and European man is well worth preserving. In fact, without their collective contributions to science, art, technology, literature, and culture, much of the modern world would not even exist.

European people gave the names by which most of the world is known. Africa, Asia, America, and Europe (of course) are all names which were first applied to those regions by Europeans, dating back to Roman times in the case of Africa and Asia.

European people gave the modern world its form and appearance.

It is no coincidence that the clothes which most of the world's population wears, or to which they aspire, are European dress.

Very few Africans, if they can help it, wear "traditional" African dress attire (which was either naked or basic animal skins); and very few Asians wear traditional Asian attire (kimonos and so on).

Very few American Indians wear their traditional dress (which was also, certainly at the beginning of the Age of Exploration, naked or basic animal skins).

All people on earth dress like Europeans, and not under order of any law or injunction: they do so out of a universal sense of aesthetics which is peculiarly European in origin.

It is also no coincidence that most of the world uses the technology gifted to it by European people.

Even the black supremacists, who openly abuse white people, use the Internet, electricity, and computer technology, given them by European people, to carry out their propaganda campaigns.

They read and write books, using European script, and European printing, and use European-invented reading glasses when their eyes fail. They use European-invented microphones and electricity in their meetings, and gather in buildings only made possible because of European-invented building methods and materials.

From the vast sweeps of Asia through to central Africa and South America, all peoples of the earth rely on European-developed technology for many of their day-to-day living needs.

If the objective reader considers all the modern conveniences with which the world is blessed—be they household electrical appliances, building materials, books, printing, clothing material making techniques, medicine, modern farming irrigation methods or indeed, almost anything one can think of which is needed in modern-day life—then it will be seen that all these things are European in origin.

Even the "luxury" wonders of the world, such as Chinese or Indian space travel, are merely imitations of the original European programs.

In other words, the contribution of European man to the world and well-being of all people is unsurpassed.

It is truly no exaggeration to say that their contribution has been the single most important of all people on earth, ever.

The Myth of "European Colonial Debt"

Many liberals talk of the "debt" which Europeans owe for all sorts of past alleged "wrongs" committed during the age of colonial exploitation.

Leaving the subjective arguments about colonialism aside, and whatever wrongs may or may not have been committed five hundred years ago, there is still no justification for the ethnic cleansing or genocide of European people today.

Slavery in the US is a case in point: relentless propaganda claims that white Americans owe a terrible burden of debt to blacks in North America, both morally and financially, for the scourge of slavery which afflicted America up to the time of the American Civil War.

The reality is, however, that the first person to legally own a slave in America was the black Angolan Anthony Johnson, who became a tobacco farm owner. By July 1651, Johnson had five black slaves working for him, and became the first legally recognized slave owner in America when a Virginia court ruled in his favor in a freedom suit of one of his servants, John Casor. Johnson won the suit and retained Casor as his servant for life, the first true slave in Virginia.

In addition, those slave traders who brought blacks to the Americas during the Atlantic Slave Trade did not gather up blacks in Africa by themselves. On the contrary, Africans were the ones to capture their fellows as slaves, and then merely sold them on.

If the "logic" of blaming whites for slavery was consistently applied, then blacks, historically speaking, bear as much, if not even more, guilt as whites.

If that was not enough, the reality is that only a tiny handful of whites in America ever even owned slaves. According to the 1860 US Census, only 393,967 white households held slaves, or around 8 percent of all American households.

All of these facts make it clear that to demand reparations from, or inflict "white guilt" upon, the majority of the modern-day white American population, is laughable and would under normal circumstances, be dismissed as a joke.

The Arab slave trade in Africa, by way of comparison, lasted far longer and involved millions more Africans than the Trans-Atlantic slave trade—but somehow there seems to be no similar demand for "reparations" against present-day Arab nations or people.

In any event, the argument of "colonial exploitation," even if it were valid, as a reason for the current dispossession of European homelands by non-Europeans, is fallacious in itself.

At some stage of history, almost all nations and all peoples have conquered or exploited other people. African tribes have done it to one another, Semites have conquered each other, Chinese, Japanese, American Indians—all people somewhere and at some time, have blood on their hands.

History is replete with examples of national rights having been abused—but the purpose of learning history is not to exact revenge for past wrongs, but to prevent them from happening again.

Finally, if there ever was any such European "colonial debt," it has been repaid a million times over since then, simply in terms of how the living standards of the entire world have been improved through European technological gifts and modern foreign aid. If anything, the "debt" is firmly the other way round: it is the rest of the world which owes the European world a mountain of almost incalculable debt.

The Legal Right to Self Determination

As already pointed out, no one of sound mind would question the absolute right of the Indian people to exist.

No one of sound mind would question the right of the African people to exist.

No one of sound mind would question the right of the Chinese people to exist.

There are international campaigns afoot to ensure the right of the Tibetan people to exist.

There are internationally-backed campaigns afoot to ensure the right of the Amazonian Indian people to exist.

This right to existence is known in international law as the concept of self-determination, which is a cardinal principle of the United Nations' Charter.

That document states that nations have the right to freely choose their sovereignty and international political status with no external compulsion or interference.

Chapter 1, Article 1, part 2 of the United Nations Charter states that its purpose is "To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace."

Article 1 in both the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) read: "All peoples have the right of self-determination. By virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development."

The United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights article 15 states that everyone has the right to a nationality and that no one should be arbitrarily deprived of a nationality or denied the right to change nationality.

The principle of self-determination for all people is therefore, an established part of international law and the demand for it is perfectly in line with that right which has already been granted to every people on earth.

The Moral Right to Self-Determination

It is this right to self-determination which was most recently asserted by many Third World nations against domination by First World minorities, such as in South Africa and other African countries.

In South Africa, for example, the African people argued, in terms of the principle of self-determination, that they had a right to rule themselves independent of white immigrants.

In that sense, they were of course completely correct. Europeans did not have the right to move into African lands and rule over the African people.

But therein lies the rub: if it was wrong for Europeans to do that to Africa, it is equally wrong for Africans to do that to Europe. It is merely the exact same process, but this time in reverse.

It is the inalienable right of every people on earth to rule themselves in their own territory, free from foreign domination.

In that last sentence are the two critical elements of all peoples' rights: self-rule, in one's own territory. In fact, one without the other is impossible.

Self Determination for Europeans Is the Opposite of White Supremacism

From the foregoing, it is apparent that the demand for self-determination for any particular people is not based on outdated notions of "white supremacism" or any arguments about racial superiority or inferiority.

The demand for self-determination—and self-rule in one's own territory—specifically excludes the traditional association of racial supremacy as rule over others. Racial Supremacists (whose favorite iteration in leftist media terms is the "white supremacist" stereotype) seek to assert their supremacy over other races and to rule them.

A proponent of self-determination, on the other hand, seeks no such supremacy and specifically eschews the claim to rule over others. Self-determination in one's own territory is therefore the very opposite of racial supremacism. In the European sense, the demand for self-determination is therefore, the very opposite of "white supremacism."

Case Study: Indian Self-Determination and That Nation's Racially-Based Immigration Laws

For centuries, the peoples of the Indian subcontinent found themselves subjected to British colonial rule. While the British brought many advantages (much of the infrastructure upon which the modern Indian state was created, was built by the British), ultimately, the Indian people had the right to self-determination and rule over their own affairs.

As a result, the state of India is now an Indian homeland, majority occupied by Indians and under no threat of foreign domination.

The Indians have, justifiably, taken steps to ensure that India remains Indian. One of the measures includes what is known as a PIO Card immigration system.

In terms of this system, the "Persons of Indian Origin" (PIO) visa is applied to people of Indian origin, defined through their "birth or residency, or that of their parents or grandparents."

According to the Bureau of Immigration at the Indian government's Ministry of Home Affairs, "All persons of Indian origin who are in possession of the passport of any other country except Pakistan, Bangladesh, Afghanistan, Nepal, Bhutan, China, Sri Lanka or any other country specified by the government, are eligible for PIO Card if:

1. He/She had any time held an Indian passport.
2. He/She or either of his/her parents or grandparents or great grandparents was born in India or permanent resident in India provided neither was at any time a citizen of any other specific country.

3. He/She is a spouse of a citizen of India or a person of Indian origin covered under 1 & 2 above."

The second type is known as "Overseas Citizenship of India" or OCI for short. Overseas Citizenship of India allows the legally defined "Persons of Indian Origin" who have obtained citizenship of another nation, to acquire long-term leave to remain in India.

According to the Bureau of Immigration at the Indian government's Ministry of Home Affairs, persons are eligible to apply under the OCI scheme, if it can be shown that they, their parents, or their grandparents:

"1. [Were] eligible to become a citizen of India at the time of commencement of the Indian Constitution i.e. 26.01.1950. OR

2. Belong[ed] to a territory that became a part of India after 15.01.1947. OR

3. [Were] a citizen of India on or after 26.01.1950."

OCI holders can acquire full Indian citizenship after five years. OCI cards are granted for life and offer many of the benefits of a PIO card with the advantage that holders do not have to register their presence in India, however long their stay may be—unlike all other foreigners.

This means that an Indian born in Britain can apply for, and receive, Indian citizenship even though they or their parents have never even seen India.

In other words, Indian immigration law is specifically designed to ensure that India remains racially homogeneous by only granting permanent residence to those born of racial Indian stock, no matter where in the world they might have been born.

This perfectly sensible policy is hardly known outside of India, and certainly no one will accuse the Indian government of being "Indian supremacists" for wanting to ensure that their immigration policies are designed to keep India Indian.

Ethnostates Are a Universal Right

Self-determination in an ethnostate—a state made up primarily of one racial group, are therefore not unusual or exceptional by any degree. Japan, China, India, most sub-Saharan African states, most north African states, most middle-Eastern states, and, of course, Israel, are all ethnostates with varying degrees of legal enforcement designed to ensure that they keep their homogeneity.

In exactly the same way, European people have a right to maintain their identity and be free from outside domination and extinction.

There would be an international outcry if it emerged that say, Indians were on the point of extinction in India, and were being replaced by Chinese people.

Yet for some reason, not a word is said when it is Europeans on the verge of extinction.

Liberals of all hues will rush to the defense of the Tibetan people in their struggle against displacement by the Chinese Han people—yet those same liberals will ignore the exact same scenario playing itself out in European nations.

In exactly the same way that the Tibetan people have a right to rule themselves in Tibet, free from foreign (Chinese) occupation, domination, and ultimate extinction through absorption and integration, so the European people have that same right.

The Continued Existence of a Culture Is Dependent upon the Continued Existence of Its Founding People

In any given territory, the people making up the society in that territory create a culture which is unique to themselves.

A society or civilization is only a reflection of the population of that particular territory.

For example: the Chinese civilization is a product of the Chinese people, and is a reflection of the makeup of the population living in China.

The Chinese civilization is unique to the Chinese people; they made it, and it reflects their values and norms.

In the same way, the American Indian people made the American Indian civilization. The Japanese people made the Japanese civilization, and Australian Aborigine people made the Australian Aboriginal civilization; the Zulu people made the Zulu civilization, and so on. In the same way, obviously, the European people created the European civilization, broken down into its component parts: English, Scottish, German, French, Russian, and so on.

The important point to remember is that each culture is unique to its creating group. Although each culture, each civilization, may—and indeed do—have differing levels of technological achievement, and moral codes (what is acceptable in Japan may not be acceptable in Norway, for example, and vice versa), there is no justification to claim superiority or inferiority.

As each civilization is unique to its founding population, it is also obvious that should the founding population vanish, the culture which they created will vanish along with them.

As the Chinese people made the Chinese civilization, it logically follows that the Chinese culture would disappear if the Chinese people were to disappear.

Presently the overwhelming majority of Chinese people live in China, maintaining the Chinese civilization in that land.

If, however, Australian Aborigines immigrated into China in their millions, and the Chinese population was dramatically reduced in numbers, then in a few years the character of Chinese civilization would change—to reflect the new inhabitants of that territory.

In other words, the society or civilization of that territory would then reflect the fact that the majority of inhabitants were now Aborigines rather than Chinese people.

If China had to fill up with Aborigines, this would mean the end of Chinese civilization.

Aborigines would create a new civilization which would reflect themselves rather than the Chinese people.

That this should happen is actually perfectly logical. It has nothing to do with which culture is more advanced, or any notions of superiority or inferiority. It is merely a reflection of the fact that a civilization is a product of the nature of the people making up the population in the territory.

To go back to the Chinese example: if all Chinese people on earth had to disappear tomorrow, then fairly obviously, Chinese civilization and culture would disappear with them. It is this obvious principle which determines the creation and dissolution of cultures—namely, once the people who create a certain society or civilization disappear, then that society or civilization will disappear with them. If the vanished population is replaced by different peoples, then a new society or culture is created which reflects the culture and civilization of the new inhabitants of that region.

Case Study: The Racial Demographic Displacement of the American Indians

There are numerous examples of this process at work. One which will be familiar to all is the shift which occurred in North America. The American Indian people lived there for thousands of years, creating a civilization which dominated that continent.

In other words, the civilization and culture which dominated North America reflected the fact that the American Indian people lived and formed the majority population there.

After 1500 AD, however, that continent filled up with white immigrants from Europe. These white immigrants displaced the American Indians by squeezing them out of possession of North America, thereby replacing the American Indians as the dominant population of that continent.

The great shift in North American civilization then occurred. Whereas the American Indian culture had dominated for thousands of years, in a few hundred years the dominant civilization on that continent had become white European.

This shift reflected the fact that the majority of inhabitants of North America were white Europeans—and the American Indian civilization, for all practical purposes, disappeared. The American Indian civilization in North America "fell" because the population of North America changed.

If the society which has produced a particular civilization stays intact as a racially homogeneous unit, then that civilization remains active. If, however, the society within any particular given area changes its racial makeup—through invasion, immigration, or any decline in numbers—then the civilization which that society has produced will disappear with them, to be replaced by a new civilization reflecting the new inhabitants of that territory.

A civilization—any civilization, be it white, black, Asian or Aboriginal—stands or falls by the homogeneity of its population, and nothing else. As soon as a society loses its homogeneity, the nature of that society changes to reflect the makeup of the new population.

History is teeming with examples of where this has happened. In fact, every time that a great culture or civilization has come to an end, a change in the founding population can always be detected.

This principle is perfectly obvious: as long as a people stay intact, their civilization and culture will remain intact. If those people diminish in number, or become a minority in their own territory, their civilization and culture will also diminish, or vanish completely.

This is a logical consequence of a change in population, and is not a reflection of the supposed "superiority" or "inferiority" of any culture.

The conclusion is therefore obvious: if First World nations experience a demographic shift which sees their populations replaced by Third World immigrants, then, inevitably, the prevailing culture of those First World nations will change to reflect the culture of the new majority population.

In other words, mass Third World immigration into First World countries will see First World culture replaced by Third World culture, once the mass immigration reaches such levels as to inevitably bring about a change in the nature of those nations' cultures.

This, then, is what is at stake: the very existence of First World culture. It has nothing to do with hating any person because of the color of his skin, or of trying to deprive any person of the opportunity for improvement.

This has to do with the survival of the West, of the continued existence of the European people. This is what this book is about, and what needs to be done to ensure that Western culture—and the Western people who created it—survive.

Chapter Two: The Historical Background and the Current Reality

TO understand why European people face, for the first time in their existence of more than thirty thousand years, extinction as a genetic group, it is first necessary to gain an overview of the historical situation which has brought about the current dilemma.

We must perforce deal only with what is called "modern" Europe, and not that of antiquity. This is so not only because of space reasons, but also because the situation of the second decade of the twenty-first century is the product of post-classical developments in Europe.

Non-Europeans the First Colonizers of Europe

Prior to the year 1400 AD, the "colonial powers" were exclusively non-European in nature. The Moors (a mixed-race invasion force from North Africa and the Semitic heartlands) invaded Iberia and advanced into central France, while the equally mixed-race Ottoman Turks invaded from the southeast.

After conquering Byzantium, later renamed Istanbul, the Ottoman Turks seized much of the Balkans and were only finally turned back at the gates of Vienna in 1683.

It took nearly one thousand years to expel the Moors from Iberia (a task which was only completed in 1492) and even longer to expel the Ottomans from the Balkans (a task which was only completed at the end of the First World War in 1918). The first colonizing powers in Europe were therefore non-European, a fact which is conveniently ignored by present-day liberal historians.

Renaissance Sparks Age of Exploration

Prior to 1400 then, the only cross-racial influence of any major impact between the continents of Europe, Africa, and Asia, were the Moorish and Ottoman invasions. The impact of those invasions is another topic all to itself; suffice to say here that the impact was felt, culturally and genetically, in the regions they occupied.

Nonetheless, it is still correct to assert that prior to 1400, the continents of Europe, Africa, Asia, and the Americas were all still relatively isolated from one another, and had, to the greatest degree, developed their own forms of society, systems of government, culture, and identity.

Nonetheless, in the interim, Europe, freed from the theological restrictions of the Dark Ages by the Renaissance, embarked upon a great flowering of civilization, science, and technology.

It was inevitable that this flowering would lead to the Age of Exploration, and from the 1400s onward, Europeans set off in waves of exploration, and ultimately conquest, of what would later be called the "New World" and the "Third World." (As an aside, even in the difference in those names, much significance can be read.)

The Age of Exploration led directly to the colonization of much of the rest of the world by Europeans. Through a combination of massive technological superiority and an adept skill at playing off indigenous people against each other, tiny groups of Europeans conquered and colonized almost all of the world.

The present-day countries of the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand were founded and majority colonized by Europeans, while white minorities colonized and created all the present-day nations on the continents of South America and Africa.

Even many of the nations in South East Asia were initially created by white minority settlers, but, as was the case with many South American states and Africa, huge growth patterns in the native birth rate (spurred on by Western medicine and education) soon forced an early exit to the white minority ruling class.

By the close of the nineteenth century, the end result was that vast areas of the globe were either completely under the sway of white Europeans, or were ruled by white European colonialists.

At the time, many in the West presumed that this state of affairs would persist forever, and it never dawned on them that the entire colonial structure was artificial.

Those few Europeans who did have the foresight to see what was coming, did try and warn their fellows. Most notably, the American writer, eugenicist, and journalist T Lothrop Stoddard, in his groundbreaking *The Rising Tide of Color against White World Supremacy* (1921), accurately predicted the future of white colonies in Asia, Africa, and South America, and warned against Third World immigration into Europe, North America, and Australia.

Despite its title, the book did not promote "white supremacy," but only pointed out that the eighteenth and nineteenth century view of Europeans ruling other nations was coming to an end.

Stoddard was not interested in whites ruling other races, but rather in the preservation of white heartlands, and hence his warnings about Third World immigration.

Decolonization and Recolonization—of Europe

It is nowadays fashionable to regard the forcible expulsion of white minority rulers from Africa and Asia as justified conflicts, and, of course, from the indigenous peoples' point of view, they were. For it is indeed the right of all people to rule themselves, free from foreign domination, in their own homeland, where they can exercise their right to self-determination and not be ruled by others—but this right extends also to European people.

The decolonization process which proceeded from the end of the Second World War saw all white minority regimes removed from power in Africa (apart from the very southern parts of that continent, where more entrenched minorities took longer to replace) and by the 1960s, only a tiny number of former colonial nations were still under European control.

The ideal of self-determination for these people had been attained, and they were welcomed into the United Nations as fully-fledged member states in their own right. At the same time, however, a reverse colonization process started. Slowly at first, but then speeding up, increasing numbers of Third Worlders started entering European nations.

Third World Immigration—Facts and Figures

The dramatic increase in the number of Third World-origin immigrants in various European nations illustrates the current situation.

- According to official statistics, 3.2 percent of the population of Spain were "foreign-born" in 1996. By 2007, this figure had leaped to 13.4 percent. From 2002 through 2008, the Spanish population grew by 8 percent—of which 6 percent were of foreign extraction.

- In 2009, the top seven baby boys' names in Brussels, Belgium, were Mohamed, Adam, Rayan, Ayoub, Mehdi, Amine, and Hamza. It is estimated that more than half of the residents of Brussels, the *de facto* capital of the European Union, are Third World in origin.

- By 2006, the French National Institute of Statistics (INSEE) estimated that there were in excess of 10 million immigrants and their descendants in France. This is most likely an underestimate, as French law forbids the collection of ethnic origin data. According to a 2004 study, there were approximately 14 million persons of "foreign ancestry," and if illegal immigration is included, the total rises to at least 14 million, or 20 percent of the population of France.

- In 2009, the Dutch government reported that about 20 percent of the population of the Netherlands had "non-Western" roots. By 2005, more than a quarter of all school-age children in the Netherlands were nonwhite.

- In 2007, around 13 million people in Germany were of non-German descent (first and second generation, including mixed heritage). This represents around 15 percent of the total population. In 2009, 60 percent of those aged five years and younger in the big cities have at least one parent born abroad.

- The 2011 census in Britain revealed that, percentage wise, the white British population is dropping by nearly 8 percent of the total every ten years.

Given this rate of drop, combined with natural reproduction rates of already present Third World immigrants, Britain will lose its majority white population by 2040, and in the younger age categories even sooner. Mohammed has been the most popular name for new baby boys in Britain since 2007.

- According to the Austrian Statistical Bureau, around 15 percent of the country's population are non-Austrian. In 2008, 16 percent of Vienna's population was Third World in origin and in 2012, 53 percent of all school-age children in Vienna were of immigrant origin.

- In 1980, Third World immigrants made up less than 1 percent of Denmark's population. By 2009, this figure had risen to 8 percent.

- In 2009, 10 percent of Norway's population of 4.7 million were of Third World origin. In 2005, 64,000 children were born in Norway of two foreign-born parents, compared to only 13,800 people born to parents of European origin. At those rates of growth, Norway will have a nonwhite majority by the year 2035.

- In 2009, some 13 percent of Sweden's population of 9 million were of Third World origin.

- According to Canadian government figures, the Third World-origin element of the population jumped 27.2 percent to nearly 5.1 million individuals in the five year period between 2001 and 2006. In 2009, Third World immigrants made up 42.9 percent of Toronto's residents, and 41.7 percent of Vancouver's population. Canada is set to lose its white majority population by 2040 at the latest.

- In 1960, whites made up 85 percent of the American population. By 2000, this had dropped to 69 percent, and according to the 2010 census, stood at 64 percent. Whites will stop being a majority in the US by 2043, and will be a minority of all school-going children by 2019.

- In 2010, the District of Columbia and four states: Hawaii, California, New Mexico, and Texas—had majority nonwhite populations, and a number of other states were at tipping point. In 2012, 87 percent of voters over age 65 were white, but among voters under age 30, just 58 percent were white.

- In the 2011 Census, some 60.2% of Australia's population declared European ancestry. A significant number declared "Australian" ancestry (35%) so it is not impossible to presume that the total European origin population of that country is around 80 percent. This would tie in with other estimates which claimed that by 2015, some 25 percent of the Australian population would be of non-European in origin.

- In the 2006 census, some 67 percent of New Zealand's population declared themselves of European origin, a figure which has shrunk from 92 percent in1961.

It is important to consider that these are just the official figures, and do not include, as a general rule, illegal immigration. It is estimated that thousands of North Africans, Asian, and sub-Saharan Africans enter Europe illegally via the Mediterranean Sea or over the Turkish–Greek border.

Given the official figures alone, demographers have predicted that western Europe is set to be overrun by Third World immigrants before the year 2050.

There is an inexorable eroding of the European base of a number of traditionally white nations through mass immigration and natural reproduction rates among already present immigrants.

It is clear to all but the incurably stupid, ignorant, or deliberately blind, that if the current trends continue, European people, and European people alone, will be physically exterminated from Western Europe within one hundred years.

Eastern Europe is a region which makes up a critical element of this book's thesis and it is appropriate to now review its current racial demographics alongside those of the former Soviet Republics of the Ukraine, Belarus, and Moldova, and, of course, the Russian Federation.

Russia's Demographics in 2010

The 2010 census estimated the population of Russia to be 142,905,200. Of this number, ethnic white Russians made up 80 percent, with the majority of the nonwhite population concentrated in the far east and south of the country.

This means that there are around 109 million whites in Russia, as of 2010, and in excess of 35 million people of other races, which include central Asiatic and Mongoloid. Russia's most pressing problem is not immigration from Africa (although an influx is increasing year-on-year) but in immigrants from the mixed south and Muslim former Soviet republics: Georgians, Armenians, Azerbaijanis Tajiks, and others. In 2009, it was estimated that there were 12 million illegal immigrants in Russia, most from these regions.

It has been predicted that the Chinese population in the eastern portions of Russia, that is, beyond the Ural Mountains, will become the dominant ethnic group there by the year 2030.

Eastern European Demographics

The states of Eastern Europe were, in 2010, those areas least affected by mass Third World immigration. This is primarily due to their comparative isolation until the time of the fall of the Soviet Union, and by the economic damage inflicted by five decades of Communism.

This economic backwardness resulted in relatively (compared to western Europe) poor societies, which did not attract Third Worlders. As these nations develop and advance economically, this is sure to change.

The only significant non-First World population element in these nations is either Gypsies or Turks, with both of those groups dating to pre-twenty-first century migrations. All of the figures below were accurate as of 2008, unless otherwise specified.

Poland had a population of just over 38 million, of whom less than a few hundred thousand were of recent non-European extraction.

Some 96 percent of the population was ethnically Polish, with more than half of the remaining 4 percent being European of some other nationality. The estimated 1.5 to 2 percent of the remaining population was thought to be Gypsy in origin.

The Czech Republic had a population of some 10.4 million, of whom less than 100,000 were of recent Third World extraction. It was estimated that between 250,000 and 350,000 Gypsies lived in the Czech state.

The Slovak Republic had a population of some 5.4 million, of whom less than 1 percent were of recent Third World extraction. However, the Gypsy population was estimated to be anywhere between 5 and 10 percent of the population.

Hungary had a population of just fewer than 11 million, of whom less than 1 percent were of recent Third World extraction.

The number of Gypsies was estimated to be in excess of 600,000, although the exact figures were disputed.

Romania had a population of just over 22 million people, of whom around 92 percent were ethnically European in origin.

The rest were either Gypsy, or, bizarrely enough, Chinese, who had an identifiable presence in the capital city of Bucharest. The majority of the Third World-origin population was either Turkish (10 percent) or Gypsy (at least 5 percent, and possibly more).

Ukraine, Belarus, and Moldavia

The population of the Ukraine was some 46 million, of whom less than 2 percent were non-European in origin.

Belarus is another former Soviet state bordering the Ukraine. It had a population of some 10.3 million, with less than 1 percent of non-European origin.

Moldova had a total population of around 4.4 million. Less than 2 percent of the population were of non-European origin, according to that country's government.

Chapter 3: Can Europeans Survive?

THE previous chapter will have made it abundantly clear that the racial demographic changes underway in North America, western Europe, Australia, and New Zealand, are already of such an extensive nature, that they will not be reversed barring a political revolution.

Such a revolution would entail an anti-immigration party or movement coming to power in one or more of the nations involved, and subsequently stemming the Third World immigration flood.

For want of a better word, this option could be called the "democratic participation route," (discounting those who might fantasize about seizing power extra-Constitutionally).

The Democratic Participation Route

Democracy is a European invention and was originally very different to the version of democracy we know today. The original democracy, as developed by the ancient Greeks, was not a free-for-all which allowed any person, no matter what their status or origin, an equal say in the running of the affairs of state.

Even the original US Constitution, held up to be a moral triumph and beacon of enlightenment, strictly limited who could vote, especially discriminating against those of European descent who had not acquired property or societal status.

Modern democracy, however, is essentially the moral triumph of the principle of universality. It implies universal equality—a far-fetched notion even among homogeneous groups of people—and accords to each and every individual a supposedly equal say in determining the nature of the government.

Ironically, democracy in many present-day Western nations, America and Britain included, has turned into rule by the wealthy elite, and powerful lobbies.

Those politicians who dissent in any way from the lobby's interests, such as the American Ron Paul, are shunted aside even if they show a significant level of popular support.

In Britain, the Westminster system—in principle the same essentially unfair system in force in the US—also shuts out dissenters from the mainstream.

In western Europe, the somewhat fairer system of true proportional representation allows dissenters at least the ability to appear in public, even if the controlled media remains heavily biased against them.

The advent of the Internet has challenged the controlled media's monopoly on news transmission and communication, a factor of considerable importance as will be dealt with below.

Can Democratic Participation succeed?

The question of whether democratic participation can succeed in averting the demographic crisis facing the West should be considered in light of two important factors:

1. Demographic displacement in European heartlands;
2. Strict control of the democratic process by powerful lobbies and interest groups.

Demographic Displacement in European Heartlands

Firstly the demographic displacement of Europeans by non-Europeans in the former's heartlands is increasing exponentially, not gradually as on a sliding scale. While many nations—America, Britain, Holland, Belgium, France, etc.—may still in 2012 have significant white populations, it is in the faces of the under 18 age group that the future of those nations can be read.

America, it will be recalled, will be majority nonwhite in the under 18 age bracket by 2019, and many western European nations are not far behind. This exponential growth among the younger element of the population, combined with the steady dying off of the aging white population, means that racial demographic change will come far more quickly—and far more suddenly—than what many people expect.

This has a direct impact upon the ability of anti-immigration parties or movements to succeed electorally, particularly as time goes on and the percentage of younger, newer voters, overwhelmingly from nonwhite origins, grows (see the figure of US voters under the age of 30: just 58 percent were white in 2012).

The reelection of Barack Obama in 2012, despite his opponent winning in excess of 60 percent of the white US vote, has already conclusively shown that even at that early stage, it is nearly impossible for whites in America to choose the candidate of their choice to be president, without at least an 80 percent landslide vote.

Although such a large vote is theoretically possible, it is unlikely.

Nonwhites, encouraged by the biased anti-white media and establishment, regard ethnic block voting as perfectly right and normal, whereas large numbers of whites have been brainwashed into thinking it is somehow "racist" for their group to block vote on racial lines.

This mathematical certainty will only increase over the next decade or two.

Strict Control of the U.S. Democratic Process by Powerful Lobbies and Interest Groups

Almost nothing happens in many Western nations' internal political affairs without the express approval of the powerful Jewish lobby, which has tribal allies in the media and financial institutions upon whom it can call.

In this way, for example, Ron Paul, the American populist who demonstrated vast support in the Republican party primaries, was frozen out of the ballot on many occasions on account of his policy of halting foreign aid to Israel. This was achieved by a double means of attack: Paul was denied publicity in the media (so that as few as possible voters even knew that he was a candidate), and by outright manipulation of the internal party electoral processes of the main parties in favor of pro-Israel candidates, as openly admitted by Jewish Democratic Party activist professor Alan Dershovitz in an article in the *Jerusalem Post* of August 11, 2012.

Bearing this stricture in mind—and there are of course other lobbies to which politicians have to cater—it is also unlikely that the most powerful lobbies in Western capitals will willingly concede ground to anti-immigration parties or movements.

This is particularly so given the Jewish community's traditional liberal stance on most social issues (except of course when it comes to the topic of immigration to Israel and the maintenance of that Jews-only state—more on that later).

Even in states where mass immigration has caused great problems for the Jewish community—in France, for example, where Islamic anti-Zionism has clearly transgressed into open anti-Semitism, powerful Jewish lobbies still work as hard as ever against anti-immigration parties. Much the same could be said of Britain, and of course, the United States as well.

Is it Worthwhile Pursuing Democratic Participation? Yes!

As a result of the factors mentioned above, the modern Western democratic model is heavily stacked against any popular or mass pro-European ethnonationalist movement.

Does this mean such activity is pointless and should be abandoned?

The answer is simple: definitely not.

On the contrary, it is vital that modern, non-supremacist, ethnonationalist political parties and movements should increase their activities and participation, for two very important reasons:

1. It remains the best and easiest way to spread the message of ethnonationalism, which is vital for any potential solution to the crisis facing European man;
2. One or more of these attempts to take power might even be successful, and subsequently reverse the demographic crisis. Such an event (say, for a theoretical example, in Austria—not utterly impossible at time of writing) could conceivably change the chessboard once again and spark off a domino effect on other nations.

All Europeans therefore, who understand the message of ethnonationalism and what it entails, are under a moral obligation to do whatever they can to advance this idea, in any forum, in any manner (with the obvious proviso that they should not fall into the obvious traps of political necrophilia with the Second World War or the Confederacy/American Civil War. Such masquerading in the uniforms of bygone eras serve no purpose except to fall into the powerful psychological trap set by the enemies of European man).

Need to Consider all Options

However, all that said, it would be foolish to rely solely on democratic participatory politics to provide the one and only solution to threatened extinction facing Western people.

Nor is it sensible to wait and hope for an economic collapse to spur people on.

Indeed, the much-vaunted "economic collapse" will, ironically, inevitably come once the West has been colonized by the Third World. By then, of course, the demographics might very well resemble Zimbabwe, and that is hardly any solace or hope to an aging and tiny, beleaguered white minority.

Nor is it sensible to expect some type of 1776-style armed uprising, as some postulate.

The establishment has the advantage of technology—even if only inherited from the previous era of white rule—which by itself makes any sort of attempted uprising doomed (at least until such a time that the Third World element dominates to such an extent that the system starts to collapse of its own accord.

By then, however, white numbers might very well have shrunk to the point of utter insignificance, making the issue purely academic).

Therefore, it makes sense to consider all options on a global scale rather than putting all the eggs in one basket, or trying one option and then being forced back to consider something else at a later stage—especially when that "other" option might be far more difficult to achieve if started too late in the day.

The Three Alternatives which Must be Considered

Given all the factors, it has become clear that there are in reality only three routes which can be followed if Europeans are to survive the fast-approaching racial demographic tidal wave.

These options are, in this order:

1. Continue, for as long as possible, with public political activity which is designed primarily to racially awaken as many whites as possible to the reality of the racial problem and its impact upon the future survival of Western civilization;
2. Start creating autonomous European communities in all nations and areas where it is practically possible to do so; and
3. Ultimately, create a European ethnostate(s) to serve as a homeland in which the unique and valuable European people can be preserved.

It is to these last two ends that this work is aimed.

Realism and Presumptions

There are a number of presumptions inherent in focusing on creating a European ethnostate.

Some of them cut to the very heart of political activity as is currently understood and practiced by many pro-European activists around the world, and need addressing.

The first presumption is that not all Europeans can, or even should, be "saved" from the oncoming racial submersion outlined earlier.

Sixty Years of Failure

It has been a fundamental core-of-faith belief among pro-white activists in various political parties in Europe, America, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, that it is somehow possible to win over the majority support of whites in those nations to the idea of ethnic survival.

More than sixty years of effort, by parties and groups using approaches which have varied from the "hard line" to the "soft nationalist" have, for the greatest part, failed to yield any significant results.

There have been a few exceptions (Austria, mentioned earlier) and they of course provide the best reason to continue with such efforts no matter what—but the simple truth is that the vast majority of these political campaigns have been unsuccessful.

Activists must face up to this reality, and also understand why this is so.

The reasons are multiple:

- Poorly presented propaganda;
- Ineffectual leadership;
- Failure to engage on issues which matter;
- Withering "anti" propaganda waged by the far-left mass media;

And so on.

There are maybe a dozen more such reasons, but given the vast demographic changes in most western nations, these arguments have become largely academic.

Whites Have Lost Political Power in the U.S.

Even the 2012 US presidential elections show that when a majority (62 percent) of whites vote for a candidate, this vote turnout (which would have guaranteed victory for the candidate only fifteen years previously) is not enough to win anymore.

Given the large number of white liberals, and the equally large number of people who are self-classified as white but who are not and are intrinsically opposed to anything pro-European, it is now extremely unlikely that European Americans will ever take power via the democratic route.

And the same applies to most western European nations, as outlined in the racial demographics mentioned earlier.

Thus, activists are left with the following realities:

- It has not been possible to reach the majority of whites "in time" to persuade them to vote for a pro-European party or movement (for whatever reason);
- Even when presented with the choice, the majority of Europeans have preferred to vote for the establishment treason parties (for whatever reason); and

- Rapidly changing demographics make it increasingly likely that, even if the theoretical situation is reached that "whites wake up *en masse,*" they are already, electorally speaking, impotent.

Not All Whites Can—Or Should Be—Saved

- Another harsh reality for pro-European activists to face is that, due to the deliberately imposed dysgenic policies of the last five or six decades, the real number of "quality" whites, expressed as a proportion of the total, has declined dramatically. There are now more than enough undesirable whites with whom most "decent" Europeans would not wish to associate under any circumstances. This fact further reduces the total number of "recruitable" whites.
- The final brutal reality is that there are large numbers of whites who are either too ignorant, apathetic, unintelligent, or small-minded enough not to know or care about the impending racial disaster which is about to engulf them. These are the sort of people who have little understanding beyond a TV soap or what the television news feeds them—if they even watch that.

This group of whites is equally as lost to the cause of European survival as the "undesirables" mentioned above. These last two groups are, in reality, not the sort of people who are either worth "saving" or indeed who should be "saved." They are in fact an impediment to pro-European racial political salvation, and brutally put, we are better off without them.

When all of these factors are counted up, a realist will see and understand that a strategy of European survival in an ethnostate is only ever going to find traction among a minority of whites. It is to this group, therefore, that the effort must be directed.

The Psychological Rubicon Which Must be Crossed

This psychological Rubicon (that the majority of whites cannot—and indeed should not—be "saved"), once crossed and understood, makes the mechanics of creating a European ethnostate much simpler because it will bring with it a strong dose of realism and sobriety about the number of people who can be involved.

While it would be the ideal to have millions and millions of "instant" supporters, harsh reality dictates that this will not be the case.

It will take huge effort and a significant amount of time to achieve the goal of an European ethnostate—and even then, it can be assumed that certainly the majority of Europeans will live outside of its borders (at least until they are completely miscegenated away or die off due to natural causes or from being murdered).

This stark realism is a vital component of the European ethnostate strategy, and its importance cannot be overstated.

Once established and viable, a European ethnostate will act as a draw card for increasing numbers of Europeans from around the globe who are either aware, or become aware, of the genocidal consequences of "multiculturalism" and the necessity of preserving a European core territory at any cost.

Chapter Four: Moral, Legal, and Historical Justification for a European Homeland

THE previous chapters have established that all people have the right to maintain their identity and to survive as individual, distinct nations. This is, after all, what gives the world its diversity and uniqueness.

However, there is another lesson which stands out, crystal clear, about the continued survival of all distinct people. This lesson is that it is impossible for any group to maintain its identity without majority inhabiting a geographically-defined territory in which their existence is not threatened by immigration or submersion among foreign elements.

The Right of All Racial Groups to a Homeland

There is nothing strange or "extreme" about an indigenous territory which is designed to protect a particular ethnic or racial group. For example, in the nation of Brazil, there are 672 "Indigenous Territories" which make up over 13 percent of the total land area, and the Brazilian constitution recognizes what it calls the "inalienable right" of those indigenous people to their land.

In Australia, there are officially recognized "Indigenous Protected Areas" which are set aside exclusively for the indigenous people of that country.

About 15 percent of Australia's landmass is set aside exclusively for Aborigines, and land claims constitute about 65 percent of the total country's surface area.

In Belize, there are eight native Indian reserves set aside for the exclusive use of the indigenous tribes.

In Bolivia, there are at least fifteen areas set aside to protect the indigenous people from destruction by outsiders.

In Canada, the "First Nation Reserves" were created under the Indian Act.

This law also defines racially who is an Indian, and more than five hundred such reserves are set aside for the exclusive use of the Indian tribes.

In 1999, the region of Nunavat (a region the size of western Europe) was created out of the Canadian Northwest Territories in terms of the Nunavat Act—specifically with the Inuit people in mind. Nunavut means "Our Land" in Inuktitut, the language of the Inuit people.

There are similar territories set aside for Indians in Columbia, Costa Rica, Dominica, Guyyana, Peru, and even in India and Pakistan. In India, there are two "tribal belts" of people who apparently predate the Vedic peoples, one in the northwest, which includes the states of Rajasthan, Gujarat, Maharashtra, and Karnataka; and the other is called the Central India Tribal Belt which runs across the states of Madhya Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, and Jharkhand. A tribe is formally defined in terms of the Indian constitution (Article 342(i) and 342(ii)) and the list of Scheduled Tribes—who all receive special protection and treatment—totals 8.14 percent of the population, or over 80 million people. Their lands make up around 15 percent of India's surface area.

In Pakistan, the "Federally Administered Tribal Areas" is a semi-autonomous tribal region in the northwest of that country, inhabited almost exclusively by Pashtun tribes. They number over 3.5 million, or about 3 percent of Pakistan's population.

In Russia, there are ten major autonomous areas called "okrugs" which have been set up to accommodate and protect the indigenous people of the far north of that country. Although of a significant size, the number of indigenous people has remained low. Nonetheless, they have special privileges and protection in these regions.

The Tibetan Peoples' Right to a Racial Homeland

The right of the Tibetan people to their homeland—one free of Han Chinese domination—is something that almost everyone in the West is either familiar with, or has at least heard about. The organization known as "Free Tibet" was founded in1987 and today has offices in almost all European nations.

It has become so well-known and supported that it has even attracted the public endorsement of a number of parliamentarians and official bodies in Europe and the US.

According to its literature, Free Tibet stands for "the rights of Tibetans to determine their own future" and campaigns for an end to what it calls the "Chinese invasion" of Tibet." It is a member of the International Tibet Support Network (ITSN), a worldwide group of affiliated organizations campaigning for human rights and "self-determination" in Tibet.

In other words, the entire Free Tibet movement, which is supported by government figures from many nations, is nothing but a (justified) desire to restore the independence of the Tibetan people, who are racially distinct from the Han Chinese occupiers of their nation.

The above-mentioned examples are proof that the concept of a homeland for a particular people—free and independent from outside control—is already a well-established principle in international law.

The United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII)

A review of the activities of the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII), which is an advisory body to the UN's Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), provides many more such examples of special protection being granted to indigenous people.

The Secretariat of the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues was established by the General Assembly in 2002 and is based in the New York Headquarters within the Division for Social Policy and Development of ECOSOC.

ECOSOC's definition of who qualifies as an indigenous people is also worth reviewing: according to their policy document "The Concept of Indigenous Peoples, a background paper prepared by the Secretariat of the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues," issued in January 2004, the following are characteristics of an indigenous people:

"Indigenous communities, peoples and nations are those which, having a historical continuity with pre-invasion and pre-colonial societies that developed on their territories, consider themselves distinct from other sectors of the societies now prevailing on those territories, or parts of them.

"They form at present non-dominant sectors of society and are determined to preserve, develop and transmit to future generations their ancestral territories, and their ethnic identity, as the basis of their continued existence as peoples, in accordance with their own cultural patterns, social institutions and legal system.

"This historical continuity may consist of the continuation, for an extended period reaching into the present of one or more of the following factors:

a) Occupation of ancestral lands, or at least of part of them;

b) Common ancestry with the original occupants of these lands;

c) Culture in general, or in specific manifestations (such as religion, living under a tribal system, membership of an indigenous community, dress, means of livelihood, lifestyle, etc.);

d) Language (whether used as the only language, as mother-tongue, as the habitual means of communication at home or in the family, or as the main, preferred, habitual, general or normal language);

e) Residence in certain parts of the country, or in certain regions of the world;

f) Other relevant factors.

"On an individual basis, an indigenous person is one who belongs to these indigenous populations through self-identification as indigenous (group consciousness) and is recognized and accepted by these populations as one of its members (acceptance by the group).

"This preserves for these communities the sovereign right and power to decide who belongs to them, without external interference."

UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples

The Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples of the United Nations states that "Indigenous peoples have the collective and individual right to maintain and develop their distinct identities and characteristics, including the right to identify themselves as indigenous and to be recognized as such (article 8) and Indigenous peoples have the collective right to determine their own citizenship in accordance with their customs and traditions. Indigenous citizenship does not impair the right of indigenous individuals to obtain citizenship of the States in which they live (art. 32)."

World Bank Definition of Indigenous Peoples

The World Bank also has a definition of indigenous people. According to its Operational Directive 4.20, 1991, an indigenous people can "be identified in particular geographical areas by the presence in varying degrees of the following characteristics:

a) close attachment to ancestral territories and to the natural resources in these areas;

b) self-identification and identification by others as members of a distinct cultural group;

c) an indigenous language, often different from the national language;

d) presence of customary social and political institutions; and

e) primarily subsistence-oriented production."

The Definition of an Indigenous People

From these definitions, three things stand out as common factors:

- Firstly, there must be a provable and historical continuous link between an indigenous people and a landmass;

- Secondly, the indigenous people must have a large degree of homogeneity in ethnic origin, race, and culture; and

- Thirdly, there is usually an element of colonization by foreign peoples involved. Generally speaking, this involves the mass transfer of people of different ethnic or racial origin to the lands traditionally occupied by the indigenous peoples.

This occurs to the point where such colonists form a substantial part of the population and deny the indigenous people their rights in their own territory.

This includes forcing foreign cultures, traditions, and ways of life upon the indigenous people so that their native culture is placed under threat or even extermination.

In other words, those people who have traditionally occupied an area, and who are under threat from colonization by outsiders, qualify as "indigenous," by the establishment's own definitions.

These definitions were, of course, generated for the benefit of Third World peoples who had been unfortunate enough to have their way of life affected during the Age of Exploration and colonization by the First World.

Nonetheless, the principle remains the same, even when applied in reverse: First World people, or Europeans, are also indigenous and are now being colonized by Third Worlders through mass immigration, as outlined in an earlier chapter of this book.

A European Homeland Is Morally, Legally, and Historically Justified

It is of importance to note that there is no set time period for which these indigenous people qualify for their special status.

The Maoris of New Zealand, for example, have occupied those islands for around eight hundred years, and are fully-fledged members of the UNPFII.

Europeans, who have occupied their lands for far longer than eight hundred years, easily fit the bill as indigenous, and, therefore, qualify for special protection and self-determination.

The demand for European self-determination, and a European homeland, is therefore completely legally justified. They meet all the criteria for definition as an indigenous people—of Europe—in exactly the same way that all other ethnic groups do, and who are accorded such status.

The demand for European self-determination, and a European homeland, is also completely morally justified, because they are being threatened with extinction in exactly the same way that the Third World nations were during the Age of Colonization.

For what was colonization but merely mass First World immigration into the Third World? Colonization was simply large numbers of Europeans moving *en masse* to areas where other racial groups lived, and forcing their way of life, their moral codes, their technology, and their society upon those people.

But underpinning colonization was simple demographics, or the mass movement of people.

And this is exactly what is happening in reverse today, as outlined earlier. Mass Third World immigration is colonizing the First World. The principle remains exactly the same; the practical effects (the extinction of the indigenous culture and people) remain exactly the same—just the race of the actors involved has changed.

The Historical Process is No Justification for Present Day Dispossession

There is little point in trying to justify current trends based on the activities of people who lived hundreds of years ago.

In this sense, it is of no value to say that, for example, European Americans "deserve" to be colonized by Mexicans, because Europeans colonized America, or that Saudi Arabians "deserve" to be invaded because Muslim soldiers invaded and conquered the entire Middle East and much of Europe during the time of the expansion of Islam.

It is far more worthwhile—and effective—to deal with the situation as it now arises, and what the situation is likely to be within a few decades' time.

Only by starting with an outlook based in positive reality, can any realistic solution to the problem be attempted.

And this is the reality: Even though North America and western Europe, in their modern senses, were founded and built by European people, the current demographic trends indicated that this founding, indigenous population, will be reduced to minority status within the next few decades,

barring a major political revolution. It is from that basis which future planning must take place. From these facts, the following is clear:

1. The existence of the European people is under threat;
2. The European people are just as much indigenous to their lands as any other people are;
3. The indigenous European people, just like any other people on earth, can only be protected by having their own homeland, free from outside domination and interference;
4. The demand for a European homeland is legally, morally, and historically justified.
5. This demand, being in line with the rights accorded to all other people on earth, is n not something special or unique and cannot be called "supremacist" or any of the other pejorative adjectives.

Is Western Europe not already a European homeland?

The answer is that it was, prior to 1950. After that year, and in increasing waves ever since, it is has been penetrated and is currently (2013) only a few decades away from being totally overrun and majority-occupied by non-European peoples.

Eastern Europe has not been quite so affected, but the reality remains that there is currently no area on earth which has been specifically set aside, or claimed, for the European people.

In short, Europeans need, demand, and must have, their own homeland in which they can protect and maintain their identity, culture, heritage, tradition—and their unique genetic heritage which is outwardly visible in their physical appearance.

Chapter 5: Case Study 1—Orania

SOUTH AFRICA serves as a test tube case for what the future of western Europe, North America, and elsewhere will look like as the inevitability of racial demographic change overtakes those regions.

In South Africa (as predicted by Lothrop Stoddard in his book, *The Rising Tide of Color*), whites have been reduced to a tiny minority and are the victims of a relentless Third World crime wave, are heavily taxed to support the ever-burgeoning welfare-gobbling nonwhite population, are actively discriminated against through "affirmative action" for alleged past wrongs, and are generally blamed for anything which goes wrong with the new non-European masters of that land.

In the face of this, quite literally, murderous assault on their existence, a tiny group of Afrikaners were far-sighted enough to see and understand that an Afrikaner state (or in Afrikaans, a "volkstaat"), offered the only fair, just, reasonable and practical solution to their otherwise inevitable submersion into and destruction by the Third World.

The plan to create an Afrikaner homeland was, and still is, no easy task. Critical to the first step of selling the idea was persuading Afrikaners to abandon their reliance on black labor (a difficult task in a nation which routinely employed black domestic servants and whose entire economy was built on "cheap" black labor).

Nonetheless, the idea of a territory, free of reliance upon black labor, was taken up by a professor Carel Boshoff, the son-in-law of Apartheid South Africa's most famous prime minister, H.F. Verwoerd.

Professor Boshoff saw and understood what his famous father-in-law failed to see: namely that white supremacy, or rule by force, over the millions of nonwhites in South Africa, could never be anything but temporary.

Inevitably, as professor Boshoff correctly saw, the reality of demographics would overtake the strength of the white-controlled infrastructure, and a handover of power to the black majority would follow. This was, of course, what did happen to South Africa, to the letter.

Professor Boshoff was not without influence in Apartheid South Africa. He was chairman of the famous Broederbond, or "brothers' bond," a sort of Afrikaner equivalent of the Freemasons, which controlled much of Afrikaner society during most of the twentieth century.

However, when it came to the future survival of the Afrikaners, Professor Boshoff parted ways with many others of his people. Instead of choosing between the two alternatives offered by mainstream Afrikaner politicians, namely continued white supremacy versus black majority rule, he chose to opt for a third alternative: to lay the foundation for an independent Afrikaner territory which could one day evolve into a "volkstaat."

Orania Founded in 1991

To make his scheme practical, Professor Boshoff studied the demographics of South Africa carefully, and selected an area which was sparsely populated and which, with a small amount of inward Afrikaner immigration, could be majority occupied by his people.

In 1990, a small consortium under his leadership purchased the then deserted village of Orania, located on the banks of the Orange River in the Northern Cape province, for what was a relatively nominal fee.

Simultaneously, Professor Boshoff's small organization, the Orania Movement, announced that they had selected the Northern Cape as a potential Afrikaner homeland. The area selected ran from the Orange River to the Northern Cape's west coast. The reasoning behind choosing this area—as opposed to the other areas proposed at the time for an Afrikaner "Volkstaat" was simple: demographics.

The Northern Cape, with its sparse population, presented the only area of South Africa which could effectively be colonized by Afrikaners with the least amount of disruption to the rest of the country.

In 2010, the entire Northern Cape, which includes territory which is outside the planned borders of Professor Boshoff's volkstaat, had only 2.3% of the country's population. Majority Afrikaner occupation could be achieved with only 500,000 or so Afrikaners moving to the area.

Majority Occupation Critical

Professor Boshoff, unlike all the other Afrikaner leaders of the time, understood clearly the relationship between political power and demographics. He knew that Apartheid, founded as it was upon a reliance on black labor, was the downfall of the Afrikaners, and not their salvation.

He laid down two criteria for Afrikaner survival:

-firstly, the need for an own area, and

-secondly, the absolute requirement for "own labor" (that is, Afrikaner labor—to do everything, from street sweeping to building—a concept that was completely foreign to the rest of the then white-ruled South Africa) and "own institutions" such as schools, local authorities, and so on.

Orania's Steady Growth

From around two dozen pioneers, many of them only part-time inhabitants of Orania, the town has now around one thousand residents, and continues to grow each month as more people arrive. In addition, more than ten thousand people are members or supporters of the Orania Movement, and it also has foreign-based support initiatives.

The town is properly incorporated as a local municipality, and is recognized by the South African government as such. It is possibly the only local authority in all South Africa which actually balanced its books in 2012—on a (South African Rand) R10 million budget.

In 2012, the town boasted two schools, with a total pupil enrollment of well over two hundred, and no fewer than seventy local businesses.

The land immediately surrounding the town has also been bought up, and South Africa's largest pecan nut farm

is now owned by "Oranians," irrigated with the water rights the town has from the Orange River. Total investment in the town and area now amounts to over half a billion Rand.

In 2004, the Orania authorities introduced its own "banknote"—actually a coupon, but printed up so that it looks like a banknote. This is called the "Ora" with an exchange rate of 1:1 for the South African currency, the Rand. The Ora is a valid method of payment within the town borders, and is accepted by a locally owned and controlled bank. The idea behind it is to keep local money within the Orania community, instead of it being exported to outside the town's borders. The experiment has been highly successful.

The Ora is underwritten by Orania's own savings and credit union ("community bank.")

Sunday Times *Reviews Orania's Development*

The London-based *Sunday Times,* in a feature article written by R.W. Johnson in 2012, commented as follows on Orania:

> "As you drive through the arid vastness of South Africa's Great Karoo you become used to the dying small towns where the local populations eke out a bare existence. Then, wham!—you're in Orania, an 8,000-hectare area where hundreds of springbok wander amidst green fields and green trees, where the community is clearly absolutely booming, where everybody is white and Afrikaans and where the old South Africa still happily exists.
>
> "This is, visibly, a whites-only community, something that's not supposed to exist in the Rainbow Nation. Yet here the old idyll of white South Africa has been fully reinvented. People leave their keys in their cars, live with their doors open and children play, unmonitored, in the street until dark.
>
> "Building sites are everywhere. Plots of land that went for £1,000 four years ago now change hands for £20,000. There are supermarkets, all manner of other shops, a doctor, dentist, lawyers, architects, a bank that deals in Orania's own currency, the Ora, two

> schools and a radio station. Orania has organised many trips to Israel to study Israeli farming techniques—the Israelis too have made the desert bloom.
>
> "Orania exports jewellery to the whole of South Africa, air-freighted vegetables to British supermarkets and pecan nuts to China. The community is probably the greenest in South Africa: all farming is organic, everything is recycled and alternative energy is used wherever possible."
>
> The article goes on to quote local guide Dr John Strydom: "Recently growth has become explosive. It's stretching us in every sinew. Our present land can house 25,000 people but of course we'll buy more land."

According to the *Sunday Times,* the Orania Council pays a £1,000 ($1,600) hand-out for every child born in the town.

The report goes on to contrast Orania with the state of some other Northern Cape towns:

> "Many of the small Karoo towns are dying. The closing down of local museums (which represent both high culture and a tourism-based future) is generally a tipping point—it convinces local whites that it's time to go. So the richer whites leave, property prices fall, the poorer whites flee in panic, the number of people paying rates drops, municipal services fail and the town simply collapses.
>
> "This is particularly clear as you approach Orania. Nearby Philipstown is a ruin. The whites have left and unemployed coloureds mill around listlessly, almost all on welfare.
>
> "Many of the girls carry babies—each child earns them another welfare hand-out. Shops are boarded up and there are empty houses going to ruin. Property prices are effectively zero: why buy when you can take over an abandoned house? A dying town can be a poignant sight but a dead town is just awful, something you want to leave quickly.
>
> "And then, a few miles further on, booming Orania, with rocketing property prices and more than

> 50 businesses exporting to the world—a little green paradise. The contrast is disturbing."

Finally, the *Sunday Times* quotes Professor Boshoff (who passed away shortly afterward, leaving the Orania project under the control of his youngest son, Carel IV Boshoff) as saying that "Orania was an experiment and it has worked. Of that there is no doubt. Expansion here may not be the right way. We need another Orania on the West Coast and another in Calvinia" (another town in the region originally earmarked as a potential Afrikaner state).

Moving Toward Creating a State

The aim of the Orania Movement is, ultimately, to expand their territory way beyond just the town, and provide a homeland for Afrikaners in Africa.

As Carel IV Boshoff said in an interview shown on the Afrikaans language *Kyknet* television channel, they are realistic about obtaining full independence, which is still their ultimate goal. Carel IV pointed out that without occupation of their land, there can be no expectation of further recognition until the reality has been created on the ground—in other words, it is senseless for any group to demand self-determination in a territory which it does not majority occupy.

Carel IV explained the drive toward a state in four steps in an article in the September 2012 issue of the Orania magazine, *Voorgrond.*

This article, here translated from the Afrikaans, spells out exactly how the Oranians have gone about creating their town, and it contains so many valuable and practical lessons "learned in the field" that it is worth repeating in full:

> *"How Do You Found a State?*
>
> How do you found a state? One's usual political thoughts do not normally start at the founding of a new state.
>
> Even new states normally only come into existence by making a functional part of an existing state, such

as for example, a colony, protectorate, part of a state or a province, into an independent unit.

Those engaging in such a process must justify their actions both internally and externally so that the new state will be recognized by other nations.

The new state must be justified internally so that it gains legitimacy and can have orderly government. It must be justified externally by holding out that its homogeneous population seeks its future under its own rule and to be subjected to foreign domination.

The expectation that the prospective state, with regard to territory and population, must contain a certain degree of continuity, finds expression in the demand for nationhood on the grounds of historical [occupancy].

This is why [in Afrikaner circles] the old Boer Republics (of the nineteenth century) always seize the popular imagination [as potential Afrikaner states], and if it was not for the fact that the Boers' descendants only make up a small fraction of the old Republics' population, this could have been a real claim to nationhood.

If however history creates a people, but that people does not possess a territory which it can unquestioningly call its own and which it can develop into a state, then how can such a state be created? This is the question which confronts Afrikaners and which the Orania Movement has made its task.

The answer is apparently obvious.

The Four Steps to Creating a State

Firstly, you must choose an area where you historically have the right to settle.

Secondly, you must persuade as many of your people as possible to move to that region and create a settled and sustainable established presence. This must be achieved by using existing public and private institutions which advance your cause.

Thirdly, you must establish organs of government and exercise control as far as you can do so in a legitimate fashion, while simultaneously obtaining as much formal recognition as possible. This recognition could at first only be private in nature, but as you gain in status, official recognition will follow as you acquire the ability to exercise real control.

Fourthly, you reach a point where the practical and symbolic extent of your ability and the recognition which it enjoys, becomes experienced and described as real freedom.

Problems along the Way

This map is not quite as simple as it sounds, because the challenges and obstacles along the way are legion in number. What do you do, for example, if at the beginning only a small number of people support your idea, and how do you approach the area that you have identified?

To answer the first question, the Orania Movement simply carries on with its work, confident that time will show if it is right or wrong. I am of the opinion that we are continuously being proven correct, and the increasing support which we enjoy, proves this to be so.

The second question is of increasing importance as our first settlement in Orania succeeds and can be described as growing: how do we go to work in the chosen area?

It appears to me that there are two approaches which need to be measured up against each other.

The first is to work in conjunction with the [existing] statutory authority and expect that the chosen area will eventually fill up with your people, and from there create the Volkstaat.

As far as nation and state goes, the state takes precedence over the people, by virtue of the settlement and political control which it entails.

The second approach is founded on the idea that the chosen area is the indication of a place in which an Afrikaner concentration will be least hindered and makes the greatest impact. The aim remains to obtain an area in which Afrikaners live, work, control, and occupy. But the exact nature of the area will be the product of successful settlement, not the prescription for it. As far as people and state go, the people take precedence and the state will take its form from them.

From one angle, the difference between the two approaches is not very big and it should not be exaggerated. But from another point of view, it makes up an important part of the Freedom Foundation's [Orania] original approach. The people take precedence over the state, and the state is not just a territory, but more than that: it is a [psychological] condition of freedom."

The Lessons from Orania

There can be no doubt that, given the extreme circumstances with which the Oranians have had to deal, they have been incredibly successful. Their first major obstacle—persuading their people to give up black labor—has proven to be the most difficult, and thankfully this is not an issue anywhere else in the world.

Secondly they have had to operate within the confines of an extremely hostile state, with relatively little money and even a good deal of scorn and mockery from the traditional Afrikaner "right" which regarded them with as much hostility as did the left.

The real lessons which can be learned from Orania are outlined in the stark realism which pervades their approach and achievements:

1. No matter what the historical claims might be, real power only comes from demographic majority possession;
2. It is better to deal with current reality than provoke an unwinnable conflict;
3. Self-determination will only come in stages as a population base is built up. This means that unrealistic demands for "independence" when the majority of the population in the area does not support such a drive, is a daydream fantasy.

Orania offers the only hope for Afrikaner survival, and, even more importantly, has mapped out the path for beleaguered First World populations all over the world.

Chapter 6: Case Study 2—Zionism and the State of Israel

THE Zionist seizure of Palestine remains one of the most politically controversial events of the post-World War II era, and a source of conflict which sputters on, varying in intensity and effect. Nonetheless, it is a case worth studying, because Zionism is simply racially-based Jewish ethnonationalism, and, moreover, it has been successful in creating a Jews-only homeland.

This is the only practical and surviving ethnostate in the world, and even the errors which it has made are worth noting—so that they can be avoided by anyone wishing to create a European ethnostate.

It is true that there are a number of special circumstances surrounding the creation of Israel, both positive and negative (as seen from the Zionist perspective).

Positive factors include the unity of the Jewish people and the power of the Jewish lobby in America to keep a support lifeline open to Israel, while negative factors include the displacement of, and resultant conflict with, the Palestinian and Arabs. It is not, however, these factors which should be the focus of our attention. Rather, we should look at and see the methodology which the Zionist movement used to create the Jewish state, and then see if it can be replicated without making the same sort of errors.

The Originator of the Zionist Ideal: Herzl's **Der Judenstaat**

The Zionist movement was formally launched by Theodor Herzl in 1896, although the first agitation for a Jewish state

started several decades earlier. Herzl, however, was the first to put together a coherent plan, which was then taken up by fellow Jews and ultimately became the World Zionist Movement which created Israel.

Herzl's plan, which he put down in his 1896 book, *Der Judenstaat,* contained six chapters:

I. Introduction
II. The Jewish Question
III. The Jewish Company
IV. Local Groups
V. Society of Jews and Jewish State
VI. Conclusion

Rationale for the Demand for a Jewish State

Chapter I of Herzl's book deals with the basic concept of the demand for a Jewish state.

He anticipated some of the antagonism that the ethnonationalist Zionist idea would cause, especially among those who argue for the abolition of nationalism, and any racially-based identity politics in particular:

> "To the first class of objections belongs the remark that the Jews are not the only people in the world who are in a condition of distress. Here I would reply that we may as well begin by removing a little of this misery, even if it should at first be no more than our own.
>
> "It might further be said that we ought not to create new distinctions between people; we ought not to raise fresh barriers, we should rather make the old disappear. But men who think in this way are amiable visionaries; and the idea of a native land will still flourish when the dust of their bones will have vanished tracelessly in the winds. Universal brotherhood is not even a beautiful dream."

The rationale for the Jews to create their own state was summed up as follows:

> "The Jewish question exists wherever Jews live in perceptible numbers. Where it does not exist, it is carried

by Jews in the course of their migrations. We naturally move to those places where we are not persecuted, and there our presence produces persecution.

This is the case in every country, and will remain so, even in those highly civilized—for instance, France—until the Jewish question finds a solution on a political basis. The unfortunate Jews are now carrying the seeds of anti-Semitism into England; they have already introduced it into America."

Referring to Jews in other countries who might not support the Zionist homeland, Herzl wrote the following:

> "This is a private affair for the Jews alone. The movement towards the organization of the State that I am proposing would, not of course, harm Jewish Frenchmen, just as it would not harm the 'assimilated' of other countries. It would, on the contrary, be distinctly to their advantage."

Herzl Outlined How Emigration Should Take Place

Herzl outlined how emigration to the Jewish state would take place:

> "Dull brains might, for instance, imagine that this exodus would be from civilized regions into the desert. That is not the case.
>
> "It will be carried out in the midst of civilization. We shall not revert to a lower stage; we shall rise to a higher one.
>
> "We shall not dwell in mud huts; we shall build new more beautiful and more modern houses, and possess them in safety. We shall not lose our acquired possessions; we shall realize them.
>
> "We shall surrender our hard-earned rights only for better ones. We shall not sacrifice our beloved customs; we shall find them again. We shall not leave our old home before the new one is prepared for us.
>
> "Those only will depart who are sure thereby to improve their position; those who are now desperate

> will go first; after them the poor; next the prosperous, and, last of all the wealthy.
>
> "Those who go in advance will raise themselves to a higher grade, equal to those whose representatives will shortly follow. Thus the exodus will be at the same time an ascent of the class."

How Anti-Semitism Serves as a "Push Factor"

Chapter II deals with anti-Semitism, and outlines the justification or need for a Jewish homeland to bring an end to Jewish-Gentile conflict.

> "The creation of a new State is neither ridiculous nor impossible. We have in our day witnessed the process in nations that were not largely members of the middle class, but poorer, less educated, and consequently weaker than ourselves. The governments of all countries scourged by anti-Semitism will be keenly interested in assisting us to obtain the sovereignty we want.
>
> "The plan, simple in design, but complicated in execution, will be carried out by two agencies: The Society of Jews and the Jewish Company.
>
> "The Society of Jews will do the preparatory work in the domains of science and politics, which the Jewish Company will afterwards apply practically.
>
> "The Jewish Company will be the liquidating agent of the business interests of departing Jews, and will organize commerce and trade in the new country.
>
> "We must not imagine the departure of the Jews to be a sudden one.
>
> "It will be gradual, continuous, and will cover many decades. The poorest will go first to cultivate the soil. In accordance with a preconceived plan, they will construct roads, bridges, railways and telegraph installations, regulate rivers and build their own dwellings; their labor will create trade, trade will create markets and markets will attract new settlers, for every man will go voluntarily, at his own expense and his own risk.
>
> "The labor expended on the land will enhance its value, and the Jews will soon perceive that a new and

> permanent sphere of operation is opening here for that spirit of enterprise which has heretofore met only with hatred and obloquy."

Argentina or Palestine?

It also discusses the question of "where," with the two main options being Argentina or Palestine, and his conclusion is that the Jewish state would be "what is selected by Jewish public opinion."

> "Shall we choose Palestine or Argentina? We shall take what is given us, and what is selected by Jewish public opinion. The Society will determine both these points.
>
> "Argentina is one of the most fertile countries in the world, extends over a vast area, has a sparse population and a mild climate. The Argentine Republic would derive considerable profit from the cession of a portion of its territory to us.
>
> "The present infiltration of Jews has certainly produced some discontent, and it would be necessary to enlighten the Republic on the intrinsic difference of our new movement.
>
> "Palestine is our ever-memorable historic home. The very name of Palestine would attract our people with a force of marvelous potency. If His Majesty the Sultan were to give us Palestine, we could in return undertake to regulate the whole finances of Turkey."

Jewish Company to Drive the Colonization Plan

Chapter III sets out the core of the project: the creation of a formal organization, by Herzl's "Jewish Company" to physically raise the money, buy land, promote Jewish immigration, the creation of industry, and so on.

> "The Jewish Company is partly modeled on the lines of a great land-acquisition company. It might be called a Jewish Chartered Company, though it cannot exercise sovereign power, and has other than purely colonial tasks," Herzl wrote.

> "The Jewish Company will be founded as a joint stock company subject to English jurisdiction, framed according to English laws, and under the protection of England. Its principal center will be London.
>
> "The Jewish Company will first of all convert into cash all vested interests left by departing Jews. The method adopted will prevent the occurrences of crises, secure every man's property, and facilitate that inner migration of Christian citizens which has already been indicated."

This "Jewish Company" became the Jewish Agency, which did indeed approach the colonization of Palestine as a business.

Chapter IV discusses how Jews would immigrate in organized groups rather than leaving it up to scattered individuals.

Significantly, Herzl pointed out that anti-Semitism, or persecution of the Jews, would be one of the biggest "push" factors which would drive Jews to the Zionist state. This is of bearing to us, given what will be the increasingly anti-white nature of many of the collapsing states.

> "Great exertions will hardly be necessary to spur on the movement. Anti-Semites provide the requisite impetus. They need only do what they did before, and then they will create a desire to emigrate where it did not previously exist, and strengthen it where it existed before," Herzl wrote.

Chapter V discusses the set-up of the Jewish state, its constitution and infrastructure, and even suggested a flag.

Chapter VI is the grand conclusion, and ends with these powerful words:

> "But we must first bring enlightenment to men's minds. The idea must make its way into the most distant, miserable holes where our people dwell.
>
> They will awaken from gloomy brooding, for into their lives will come a new significance. Every man need think only of himself, and the movement will assume vast proportions. And what glory awaits those

who fight unselfishly for the cause! Therefore I believe that a wondrous generation of Jews will spring into existence. The Maccabeans will rise again.

"Let me repeat once more my opening words: The Jews who wish for a State will have it.

"We shall live at last as free men on our own soil, and die peacefully in our own homes."

Herzl's Achievements

Herzl therefore accomplished a number of things:

1. He laid out the moral justification for the creation of a Jewish state (anti-Semitism, the demand for self-determination and so on—in other words, all the essential arguments to make the case presentable and justifiable to world opinion).

2. He mapped out a realistic plan, which, he said, might take decades to fulfill. This plan was followed to the letter, starting immediately after the foundation of the World Zionist Movement.

3. This plan entailed the holding of conferences which:

3.1 Announced the project to the world and gathered up Jewish support for the project;

3.2 Laid the intellectual effort which went into identifying the Jewish homeland, morally justified its existence, and worked on a political level to bring the state about;

3.3 Established the Jewish Agencies; and

3.4 Launched real immigration policies in tandem with Jewish support agencies from the immigrants' originating countries.

First Zionist Congress

Herzl convened the First Zionist Congress, which was the inaugural congress of the Zionist Organization (which became the World Zionist Organization), in Basel, Switzerland, in August 1897. It was attended by two hundred Jews from seventeen countries—and ten non-Jews. The latter were

barred from voting on any decisions. The congress gave official formulation to the Zionist policy, known henceforth as the "Basel program" which read as follows:

> "Zionism aims at establishing for the Jewish people a publicly and legally assured home in Palestine. For the attainment of this purpose, the Congress considers the following means serviceable:
>
> 1. The promotion of the settlement of Jewish agriculturists, artisans, and tradesmen in Palestine.
> 2. The federation of all Jews into local or general groups, according to the laws of the various countries.
> 3. The strengthening of the Jewish feeling and consciousness.
> 4. Preparatory steps for the attainment of those governmental grants which are necessary to the achievement of the Zionist purpose."

Later Zionist Congresses

Between the first conference and 1901, the Zionist Congress met every year to report back on progress and map out the following year's strategy for the colonization effort.

Between 1901 and the outbreak of the First World War (1914) the Zionist Congress met every two years, restarting again in 1921. This cycle continued until 1939, and then an "Extraordinary Zionist Conference" was held in 1942. Zionist Congresses were then reinstated after 1945, and since then have been held every four years—most in Jerusalem, which became possible after the Zionists were able to achieve the Jewish ethnostate in 1948.

The pre-1948 Zionist Congresses founded a bank known as the Jewish Colonial Trust, which was the financial instrument of political Zionism.

At the fifth Zionist Congress, the Jewish National Fund was founded which was tasked with the purchase of land in Palestine.

At the same time, a formal office for the Zionist Organization was established in Palestine by Chaim Weizmann, tasked with developing Jewish agriculture, settlement, education, land, finance, immigration, and statistics.

Balfour Declaration

With the outbreak of the First World War, many Jews supported Germany on account of its conflict with Imperial Russia—deemed then to be world Jewry's biggest enemy.

Palestine was at this stage under Ottoman Turkish rule—but after the British government undertook to turn Palestine over to the Zionists once the Central Powers (which included Germany and Turkey) had been defeated, the Zionist lobby swung firmly behind the Allied effort.

The British "Balfour Declaration" of 1917, which made that government's undertaking to the Zionist state public, was later incorporated in the League of Nation's official British Mandate for Palestine. The mandate formally took recognition that parts of Palestine were to be set aside as a national home for the Jewish people. For the first time, the Zionist effort had received formal recognition at international level.

The Palestine Zionist Executive

In 1921, the Weizmann-founded office in Palestine and its ancillary agencies became the Palestine Zionist Executive. This body became the Jewish Agency which cooperated with the British mandate authorities. Jewish emigration increased, and by 1923, at least 40,000 Jews arrived in Palestine.

In 1925, the Hebrew University was founded in Jerusalem, and by 1929, another 82,000 Jews had arrived.

From 1929 to 1939, another 300,000 Jews had arrived, mostly from Europe. During the war, Nazi-Zionist collaboration (coordinated by Reinhard Heydrich, SS General and Chief of the Reich Main Security Office) saw a large number of Jews, trained as farmers by the Nazis, smuggled into Palestine via Turkey.

In addition, another wave of illegal immigration, code named *Aliyah Bet,* organized by the Zionist movement, took place into Palestine. This wave was illegal—as was the Nazi-Zionist effort—because the British had by now placed restrictions on Jewish immigration because of the conflict it was causing with the Palestinians. The *Aliyah Bet* movement organized shiploads of Jews from Europe to enter Palestine

immediately after the end of the Second World War. It is estimated that at least another 100,000 Jews arrived in Palestine between 1945 and 1947, although this figure could be substantially higher.

When anti-Jewish riots broke out in Poland in July 1946 (over dominant Jewish involvement in the ruling Communist Party apparatus), another 250,000 Jews left Eastern Europe within a three month period from Poland, Romania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia in a Zionist-coordinated operation known as *Bricha.*

After first being moved to Austria, these Jews were then settled in Palestine as well, avoiding a British cordon (as by this stage, the British authorities were in open conflict with the Zionist movement).

Zionists Launch Terrorist Campaign to Drive British and Palestinians Out

During the Second World War, one of the leading Zionist movements in Palestine, the *Lehi* (known in English as the "Stern Gang") had formally offered to take up arms against the British in alliance with Nazi Germany if the Germans would undertake the creation of a Zionist state.

(One of the *Lehi's* leaders in this written proposal was Yitzhak Shamir, later to become a prime minister of Israel).

Nothing came of the proposal, and by 1946 *Lehi* had united with two other Zionist terror groups, the *Haganah* and the *Irgun* to form what became known as the "Jewish Resistance Movement" (JRM).

The JRM carried out a number of high profile attacks (including the 1946 bombing of the British HQ at the King David Hotel in Jerusalem and the mass murder of over 100 Palestinian villagers at Deir Yassin in 1948), all of which ultimately contributed to the British handing over control of the mandate to the United Nations.

United Nations Partitions Palestine and Creates Israel

During 1947, the UN agreed on a plan to partition Israel into a Jewish state and a Palestinian state, and to make the city of Jerusalem an "international city" because of the complexities of dividing it along ethnic and geographic lines.

The announcement that the Zionist state was to be created caused an escalation in opposition to it from the Palestinians, and a guerrilla war erupted between the two sides, with the better-armed Zionists driving Palestinians out of many of the "mixed" zones.

The end result was that on the last day of the British mandate, May 14, 1948, the Zionists declared independence—a move immediately recognized by both the United States and the Soviet Union.

The Palestinians, supported by their Arab neighbors Egypt, Transjordan, Syria, Lebanon and Iraq, refused to accept the partition plan and invaded to recover the land lost to the Jewish state.

The Communist regime in Czechoslovakia ignored a UN Security Council resolution forbidding any nation to arm either side (United Nations Security Council Resolution 50, adopted on May 29, 1948) and came to the aid of the Zionists, providing them with tanks, cannon, and plans to match the Arab forces' equipment.

The terrorist JRM became the Israeli Defense Force, and by the end of the year, the Zionists had the upper hand, driving Palestinians out of large portions of their UN partition agreement allocated land (which then were absorbed into Israel).

From this time on, Israel has been at almost constant war with the Palestinians and many of its Arab neighbors, but has each time been victorious in the "hot" wars which have erupted. These in turn have allowed Israel to continuously expand its borders, so that the modern state of Israel is nearly twice as large as the UN partition plan of 1947.

Israel's Racially-Based Immigration Law

The establishment of the Zionist state led to a renewed wave of Jewish immigration, abetted by the overtly racial law known as "The Law of Return" passed by the Israeli parliament in 1950 which granted those recognized as Jews (i.e. born of a Jewish mother) immediate right of residence and citizenship. A further indication of the racial nature of the

Law of Return came with a 1970 amendment which granted right of residence and citizenship to anybody defined as a Jew by the Nazi Nuremberg Laws.

By 2012, the Jewish population of Israel had reached 5,978,600—a remarkable rate of growth spurred on by the high birth rate among the ultra-religious element of their society.

The Zionist plan had been brought from blueprint to reality in exactly fifty-two years.

The Lessons from Israel

The relative success of the Zionist experiment has been obtained at massive cost, mainly in human terms by the native Palestinian population. This has in turn sparked decades of conflict, which in macro-geopolitical terms, has led to wars in the entire Middle East as America has had to rush to Israel's aid time and time again.

In fact, it can be said that without American foreign and military aid, it is very possible that Israel would have ceased to exist. This then, is the great lesson to be learned from the Zionist experiment: that any attempt to create an ethnostate must be done either in an area which is not heavily populated (such as the Afrikaners have done in Orania—see the previous chapter—or in an area where there is not going to be massive displacement of a different, and then hostile, ethnic group.

Apart from that proviso, the Zionist experiment has mapped out with clinical precision the steps necessary to create an ethnostate. They are:

1. Design the plan;
2. Select the target territory;
3. Set up the infrastructure to support the plan (a colonization company) which will provide the "on-the-ground" support and work opportunities for new arrivals;
4. Build the demographic levels to be in your favor;
5. Formalize immigration;
6. Seek recognition;
7. Be prepared for the effort to take decades.

Chapter 7: The Plan and Its Implementation

THE most difficult step in creating a European ethnostate is not the physical establishment of such a state; it is the gathering together of the political will to achieve that ideal.

Gathering the political willpower is what this book is all about, as without this vital first step, nothing else is possible.

As the Orania experiment shows, it is possible to launch such a project with small numbers of people. Similarly, we have to be realistic about how many people might be involved in the project.

Europeans Never So Close to Extermination as Now

It is ironic that in 2013 there are probably more people of European descent alive in the world than ever before—but never have they been so close to outright extermination as now.

This dichotomy should give any pro-European activist serious food for thought.

Most activists believe—as the author once did—that the vast majority of European people are just misinformed by the mass media, and that all that is needed is to simply lay out the facts, and they will come streaming over to the truth in their millions.

Hence the endless publications: magazines, books, and journals, all published under the "know the truth and ye shall be free" aegis.

Yet, in spite of all the facts about race, history, IQ, and genetics and with myriads of examples from which to learn (the black destruction of Detroit, the collapse of post-colonial infrastructure in Africa, Haiti, and other examples

too numerous to list here), there has been almost no significant political progress by any pro-European political movement, either in Europe or North America, Australia or New Zealand.

At the same time, rampant Third World immigration has torn apart the racial homogeneity of those regions, and stands on the point of utterly dispossessing the European peoples of their hard-won territories.

It is too easy to blame others for this situation. Blaming others is, in any event, akin to blacks blaming whites for the destruction of Detroit, or Mexicans blaming whites for the economic collapse of California.

The reality is that seventy years of "soft" welfare-based socialism in the West, combined with an active rejection of eugenics and racial science by the liberal establishment, has downbred the white population to the point where large numbers are indeed mindless sheep as the Bible accurately describes them.

Mindless Masses Cannot be Saved

These mindless masses are those who vote in their millions for TV spectacles such as the X Factor or get wildly excited over superstar black athletes throwing balls at each other in "Superbowls" and other such *panem et circenses.*

As pointed out earlier, the bottom line is that it is not possible to "save" most of these people from a fate of which they are not in the remotest sense capable of even contemplating, much less understanding and avoiding.

Millions of white Americans, for example, blinded by egalitarian liberalism, voted for Barack Obama, not once, but twice. What hope is there of convincing people such as these that there is an imminent danger to their race's survival?

Even of the millions of white Americans who voted for Romney in 2012, only a tiny minority have the vaguest clue of racial dynamics and its meaning for the long-term future and survival of America.

The harsh reality is that most of these people are simply incapable of understanding the facts of race, of history and of real science, much less being able to formulate the political will to act upon such an understanding. This same scenario applies, of course, to most European populations in Western Europe, Australia and New Zealand.

The only possible conclusion which can be drawn from this rueful situation is that the vast majority of these people are simply not going to survive.

Nature's Amoral Code of Conduct

Nature is not immoral—she is amoral. She has no right or wrong, merely rules which she has lain down in her infinite wisdom. Living creatures will either follow these rules, or they will be exterminated by other living creatures which do follow these rules.

These rules are simple: reproduce, expand, and live.

It is clear that although there are large numbers of white European people alive today, very few of them are either following Nature's rules, or even have the ability to understand them.

They are demoralized, degenerated, brain-dead and possess an ever-decreasing IQ and cultural ability. It is a harsh judgment, but one which an evaluation of the facts leaves no other conclusion.

Only those who have an understanding of what is at stake—and they will, by a matter of self-selection, be those reading this book or open to its general message of the importance of European racial survival—can be "saved" (in the traditional pro-European activists' sense of the word).

The Coming Population Bottleneck

We are therefore, heading for what is known in anthropological terms as a population bottleneck: where there are large numbers of a species, but environment and circumstances are going to combine to make it impossible for all of them—or indeed even a majority—to survive the imminent crush.

This is an unfortunate situation, but it is not necessarily the very worst of the options.

At the end of the day, would life in a meaningless, mindless and steadily miscegenating mass be worthwhile living in for any idealist, any person with higher aspirations or deeper philosophical understanding of the meaning of life? Would anyone with any sense of aesthetics prefer to live in a world composed of the slums of Brazil or the ruins of Detroit?

Pro-European activists in North America and Western Europe do not face the ideological hurdle of persuading their fellow whites to rid themselves of non-European labor, as did the Oranians in South Africa.

Instead, they have the far more difficult personal psychological barrier to overcome: the reality that it is impossible, in fact even undesirable, to save the majority of Europeans in the coming population bottleneck.

Once an activist has made peace with this concept—that the white masses are not going to rise en masse and save themselves—and indeed, are not the sort of material from which any heroic race can build itself anew, then and only then, can a realistic solution even be contemplated.

The Practical Implications: Only a Minority Can be Saved

What does this mean in practical terms?

It means that anyone serious about saving the European people has to understand and psychologically accept that the vast majority of Europeans alive today are not going to be "saved" and that most will die off as result of childlessness, miscegenation, ignorance, or physical extermination by the nonwhite races' more violent criminal element.

Only a minority—and it will be a significant minority, but a minority nonetheless—have the ability to understand the forces of history at work and act upon them.

It is to these people that an appeal for the creation of a European homeland is directed, and not at anyone else.

In terms of numbers, what does this mean? It means that expectations of "millions" of Europeans moving to a homeland are far-fetched and unviable.

The vast majority of Europeans are not, at this stage in any event, going to move anywhere, except maybe to try and retreat from the ever growing nonwhite urban areas of their former countries. A "mass exodus" to a European homeland, if it comes at all, will come only long after the formerly European nations are totally overrun, as is the case with South Africa.

It is a sad truth that the most racially-conscious whites are found in the areas that are most overrun with nonwhites. It seems that whites only "wake up" when they are already overrun, and not before.

It is for this scenario that the far-sighted must plan—the post racial apocalypse scenario.

A Planned and Structured Approach

Using the already outlined practical examples—Orania and Israel—as case studies, it is clear that a European ethnostate must be the result of a planned and structured approach. It cannot be left up to haphazard chance or individual suggestion, but must be a coordinated and significant effort.

Furthermore, as the Orania lesson has so significantly highlighted, it is unrealistic to simply declare a territory and then expect people to move there of their own accord.

People—even the most ideologically dedicated—will not move anywhere unless they are able to earn a living.

This was one of the reasons why Orania took many years to break through retiree village level—because only the very rich or retirees were able to afford to move there. It was only when work opportunities started opening up that increasing numbers of younger people started moving to the town.

Similarly, the Zionists knew that once the small beachhead had been established, the very first priority was to create a substantial work creation infrastructure which would provide newcomers with a means to make a living.

Colonization Company

To this end, a colonization company has to be formally created. This should ideally be staffed by respected and accomplished leaders and business people who have a track record of financial probity and success—and who also understand and are committed to the concept.

The duties of the colonization company must be as follows:

1. The coordination of fundraising;
2. The purchase of land in the designated area;
3. The identification of business opportunities which can be established in the designated area;
4. The creation of formal employment opportunities; and
5. The organization of the formal immigration process for groups of settlers.

In this regard, it is most likely a worthwhile tactic to approach existing sympathetic small to medium businesses to investigate expanding, not moving their existing business, into the designated area.

Such an expansion, rather than a move (for example a furniture retailer can be enticed to open a new branch, rather than relocating an entire business), is far easier to achieve and much more "sellable" than persuading someone to close up and start from scratch.

Consideration will have to be given to skill-intensive industries as well, given that modern globalization has resulted in the export of much of the West's manufacturing capacity to China.

However, this latter area of industry should not be ignored completely, for the simple fact that a viable European ethnostate will ultimately become a world center for innovation as the moribund West continues its decline—and hopefully a Eurocentric state will not make the same mistake that currently existing western nations have made in allowing their industrial capacity to be exported to the East.

This applies equally to the economic development of the chosen territory. Ideally, once enough capital is acquired, a community bank must be established, whose sole purpose must be to provide financial services to the settlers, and take over the investment projects from the colonization company.

The Orania case study shows once again that this is viable, even on a relatively small scale, never mind the huge financial clout which the Zionists were able to bear on the Israel experiment.

Another avenue which must be exploited is that of the professional services sector, particularly in the age of the Internet. Many such services can now be delivered from anywhere on the globe, and full advantage must be taken of this opportunity. Of course, the creation and supply of internet services is in itself a potential business opportunity.

In fact, by taking full advantage of the technological revolution, setting up a new state will be a thousand times easier than setting up colonies as happened during the Age of Exploration. All it requires is the willpower and the mindset.

Local Authorities First

Once again, using the Orania case study as an example, settlers and the colonization company must be realistic about the prospects of immediate full independence. It will be necessary, as has been shown in both Orania and Israel, to create the reality on the ground before any grandiose declarations of independence can be made.

The creation of, or taking over of, local authorities can only be considered once the area in question has been majority occupied by like-minded ideologically people. Then, through a process of gradual progression, successively higher tiers of government and authority can be taken over, always in proportion to the numbers involved. The only alternative to this progressive approach is the Zionist model, which created a demographic reality and then was able, with UN intervention and their global network, to launch their project into reality overnight.

This option seems, for a number of reasons (but most largely the absence of an international and powerful "European lobby") to be unlikely with regard to a European ethnostate, and hence the gradual, progressive route seems to be the only one to follow.

The colonization company must however be flexible enough to be able to seize any opportunities which may arise. For example, the sudden collapse of any existing state, or unpredictable international events may provide opportunities beyond the sight of anyone today, and full advantage must be taken of any development.

Realism Extends to Long-Term Prospects—and Defense

The birth of a new state cannot—certainly in the short- to medium-term—come about as a result of any violent secession. Those who dream that this is 1776 are kidding themselves, if only for the fact that the technological inertia created by the previous majority European state infrastructures means that surveillance methods and powerful state repressive capability will still be functional for a good many years to come, even in the hands of a growing Second World population.

As a result, a violent birth along the lines of Israel, or the United States in 1776, is unlikely and very possibly doomed to failure. There is no other real alternative but to take control of a territory incrementally, and only declare political status once majority occupation has been reached.

In this way, a peaceful method can be followed, which can then in turn be used to justify the process even more to the outside world: who would really dispute the right to self-determination?

On the other hand, the incipient state and its residents should not be under any illusion as to the reality of world racial demographics. The attractiveness of a European ethnostate to all other people as a destination will increase as the present-day western nations slide into Second World status, in the same way that they were originally targets for Third World immigration.

A European ethnostate will, sooner or later, have to defend its borders to prevent a repetition of the disaster which has struck current-day western nations. They should, however, have the advantage of not facing a fifth column of traitorous liberals in their midst, and as such will find it a lot easier to defend themselves.

All of this presupposes that the European ethnostate project is successful, of course. If not, the matter is moot.

Propaganda and Presentation

A final word on propaganda and presentation: activists working for the creation of a European ethnostate must understand that ethics, moral codes, and time have changed. Rhetoric and symbolism which seemed acceptable a few decades ago are nowadays not acceptable at all, and who knows how things will have changed going into the future.

In this regard, all presentation and arguments in favor of an ethnostate must be in non-offensive language, and devoid of symbolism which triggers subliminally-primed hate responses.

Remember always that the demand for a European homeland is nothing less than the right which is accorded to all other peoples on earth, and that this ideal is perfectly in line with the United Nations Founding Charter and numerous other internationally accepted agreements.

There is therefore no need to "justify" it by referring to what are, after all, subjective notions of inferiority or superiority.

Every people have the right to self-determination, free from foreign domination—and this should be the mantra of those seeking a European homeland as well.

If it is presented fairly, without hate or denigration of others, it will find accord with reasonably-minded people of all races, and thereby make its passage so much the easier.

The Israeli lesson teaches us that a state born in hate, supremacy, and violence, begets all that and more back. That is not the propaganda route to follow, but even with all that, there are few people who would deny the Jewish people a right to their own state—and that fact alone can be helpful in justifying the need for a European homeland in which the core of our race can survive.

Further Developments

This section has outlined only in the broadest strokes what needs to be done. Obviously, should it come to fruition, the details will have to worked out according to the situation and requirements of the time.

A printed work will therefore of necessity not have the latest developments.

Thanks to the wonders of the Internet, there is a way around this issue: by going to the website www.projectnovaeuropa.com, readers will always be able to

appraise themselves of latest developments—or otherwise—in the project.

By using the "submit" and "contact" facilities on that site, readers will be able to make suggestions, submissions, ask questions, and more about the project, and, hopefully, spread its message wider and further.

Chapter 8: The Territory

THE second hardest part of creating a European homeland (for the hardest part, see the previous chapter) is determining a territory.

This is the final step in the implementation process. Without real progress in this regard, the project will come to nothing and dissipate. The selection of the correct territory is therefore also vital to the entire success of the project.

Previous Case Studies

The Orania Movement in South Africa selected its territory on the basis of demographics. It has an advantage in that the cultural and historical roots of its target audience are in South Africa, and the concept of moving to Orania—which is at least in the same country—is not a quantum leap for its followers.

Israel and the Zionists had an easier question when selecting their territory, despite debate over where it should be. Herzl, it will be recalled, initially suggested a choice between Argentina and Palestine, and even left it open-ended enough to say that the final choice would be driven by what was possible and what world Jewry actually chose.

The decision by the Zionists to go with Palestine was driven primarily on the racial-religious roots of the Jewish people, and the resultant psychological appeal it would have on them.

Proof of this lies in the fact that the "other" Jewish homeland, still called the Jewish Autonomous Oblast *(Yevreyskaya avtonomnaya oblast),* in the far east of Russia and established in 1934 for Russian Jews to rule, never became more than 25 percent Jewish, and today is less than 10 percent Jewish. The *Yevreyskaya avtonomnaya oblast* never took off, not for lack of opportunity, but simply

because it did not seize the imagination of the movers and shakers within Zionism and Jewry as a whole.

The Preconditions for a Successful Target Area

There are, therefore, some preconditions necessary for the establishment of a successful ethnostate:

1. It should not displace an indigenous population such as the Zionist movement has done, which incurs the never-ending wrath and enmity of those people, and ultimately, the nonwhite dominated "world community."
2. It must be viable and attractive to a significant start-up settler population;
3. It should preferably have some sort of emotional or psychological attraction for its target audience; and
4. It should be relatively easy to "majority occupy" the region.

Problems and Answers

Selecting a region in the twenty-first century is far more difficult than even a hundred years earlier. This is because there are no great empires on the point of dissolution (as was the Ottoman Empire from which Israel was formed) nor are there any significant pieces of "open" land unclaimed by any present-day state.

The second major problem with selecting a territory is the current large European diaspora, where it might be impractical (for any number of reasons) to expect European Americans to move to Eastern Europe or vice versa).

Given these factors, there appears now to be only two potential options open, as detailed below.

Option One: Selecting Small Regions in Existing States

The first option is to select a small region or even a town within an existing state, and target that with a colonization project. This would have at its intention the gradual building-up of a series of such towns, preferably geographically linked, which could then at a later stage form a contiguous state.

This would probably only occur once the existing "establishment" state had collapsed in on itself as an utterly predictable and guaranteed result of its Third Worldization. This is the long-term strategy upon which the Orania model is built.

Such colonization would be focused on filling a town or region with Europeans who are ideologically attuned with the long-term nature of the project, and not simply relying on an existing largely white population as its base.

It is no good having a European-majority occupation region if the majority is hostile to the project.

This methodology could allow for colonization projects to be set up in towns in rural America, Canada, Australia, and of course, western Europe.

This would allow for the ultimate creation of several proto-states, of which some might be more successful than others.

In the US, possible target regions might include the Midwest and Northwest, or even Alaska, for example, with similar regions selected in Canada, Australia, New Zealand (South Island?), and western Europe.

The colonization project would follow the organizational outline as described earlier, with a priority being on job creation to attract settlers.

Such an approach would solve the twin problems of

(a) identifying areas which impinge upon existing states, and

(b) the issue of transnational or transcontinental immigration. It would be much easier, for example, for European-Americans in California to move to Kansas, Nebraska, North or South Dakota, Montana,etc. than to make a trek to a completely new country.

This approach could only be undertaken on the explicit understanding—as the Oranians have accepted—that this is a long-term project which would very likely only result in full proper independence once the "rest" of the "host" nation had collapsed.

Option Two: A Direct Approach to Demographically Suitable and Receptive Nation States

Following the Zionist example, a direct political approach can be made to an already existing and potentially sympathetic state for permission to start the genesis of a European homeland within their borders.

Herzl for example, suggested a direct approach to the Ottoman emperor, the German kaiser, and others, as a way in which the path for the seizure of Palestine could be facilitated.

The world racial demographics outlined in an earlier chapter show clearly that Eastern Europe and western Russia offer the most demographically desirable regions for a larger, more "instant" European homeland.

In addition to the highly favorable demographics of that region, many of the states east of Poland have social orders which are hostile to classical western liberalism, and some even have authorities who are aware of the issue of European decline and low birth rates.

The Russian government, for example, is acutely aware of the birth rate issue and already has programs in place (as of 2013) to boost the white Russian population.

There are even some who suggest that Siberia would be suitable as a potential colonization area. Others suggest the Republic of Belarus, which lies between Poland and Russia, and was created out of the former Soviet Union. Like many of these states, Belarus currently has a negative population growth rate and a negative natural growth rate.

The Ukraine is another potential region, as is the Republic of Moldova. Even the Baltic states of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are all potentially viable.

A committee of responsible, capable, and important people might very well find it possible to approach any of these nations' governments directly to address declining population levels through a program of European-inward migration from around the globe, on the understanding that it would buttress and benefit the existing states.

In this regard, the geopolitical realities of those nations should be considered. Many of these former Soviet bloc Eastern European nations are seriously concerned about population declines and have seen what has happened in Western Europe—and have launched pro-white birth-rate population drives of their own.

In December 2012, for example, Russian President Vladimir Putin went on record as saying during his state address that "Our women know what to do, and when," while announcing that in 2012, for the first time since the fall of the Soviet Union, there were more births than deaths in Russia.

"The demographic programs enacted in the past decade are, thank God, working," Putin said.

He has previously proposed a "mother capital" program which would pay Russian women up to $10,000 to have a second child, and in his December 2012 remarks added that the "three-child family should become the norm in Russia."

While these remarks do not mean that the Russian government—or any other former Soviet state's government—is overtly committed to the racial cause, it is at the least an indication that there is an awareness of the nature of the problem, and a desire to do something about it.

Any approach to one or more of these states would have to be undertaken in a diplomatic and confidential manner, and by highly respected people of stature and standing, if it is to be taken seriously.

Such an approach would in effect seek permission to formally organize immigration parties, subject to final control by the target state, which would have the intention of economically strengthening that nation through the introduction of skills, investments, and people.

The advantage of this option would not only be a potentially sympathetic government, but also an already established nation-state infrastructure.

Final Decision on Territory Open-Ended and to be Decided by the "Europeanists"

Ultimately, the above options are, at time of writing, all just proposals. As Herzl wrote, a final territory will be determined by what can be realistically obtained and by common consensus among those who wish to create a European ethnostate—the "Europeanists," to coin a descriptive phrase.

The Internet will help greatly in the final determination of a territory. If this idea takes off, it will be possible for people from all over the globe to make submissions, suggest ideas, places, towns, or regions according to their own specialist knowledge. The website www.projectnovaeuropa.com can be utilized for this purpose.

To repeat: the ultimate decision will lie in the hands of the Europeanists, if there are enough of them, and if they have the willpower to make it happen.

Chapter 9: Conclusion

The Naysayers

THERE will, naturally, be the naysayers who argue that it is an impossible dream to create a European ethnostate. However, before anyone dismisses the concept out of hand, they would do well to come up with any real alternative.

Given current political and demographic trends, it is clear that the democratic election option has already passed its racial tipping point in America, and many western European nations are not far behind.

This means there is a tiny window, at best, for a democratically-driven reversal of the suicide of the West—and a wise man would do best to try and cover all the options, rather than putting all the eggs into one basket.

It contributes little, and is easy, to shoot an idea down. It is less easy, however, to produce a viable alternative. Naysayers should bear this in mind, and even the most cynical will be forced to agree that there are no alternatives to geographic consolidation.

What is the Alternative?

The historical record is clear: those people who do not possess a territory in which they form the majority population, are doomed to extinction.

Before dismissing the concept of a European ethnostate out of hand, one should rather consider the alternative: the total destruction of the European people, their civilization, and culture.

Posited against that scenario of endless night, the idea of a European homeland seems quite viable, and indeed, the only alternative.

The Form of the State

It might here be fitting to answer, briefly, some of the more detailed questions which might emerge about what type of government, laws, language, national identity, economic system, and so on the proposed state would have.

These are issues, the author believes, which are secondary to the overall aim of this booklet, which is the gathering together of the political will to create the state in the first place.

Ultimately, as with the precise location of the territory or territories selected, these matters will also be the product of what the Europeanists decide for themselves. Ideally, they would first be refined in a wide-ranging internet-based discussion and then properly affirmed at an international conference—in the same manner as that which took place at the very first World Zionist Conference.

However, because people will ask these questions right now, here are a few opinions from the author on these topics:

Form of government: An elected government, based on a true Proportional Representation democratic model in which a party which wins 20 percent of the vote gets 20 percent of the seats.

This model is currently in place in many western European states, and is clearly fairer than the first-past-the-post system which is part of the US and UK political processes. This obviously predicates the creation of a state which is large enough to warrant such elections;

Laws: As determined by the legislature. A written constitution bearing a bill of rights with fundamental principles should be binding upon the legislature, enforceable by a Supreme Court.

Language: This is likely to be determined by the location of the territory/territories involved. In this regard, the rule spelled out by the American racial thinker T. Lothrop Stoddard, in his book *Racial Realities in Europe:* "Nationality is what people think they are; race is what they really are," should be borne in mind: that language and national identity should not be the most critical issue. All ethnicities and cultures are the product of race, and almost everything can be recreated once again further on down the line should the race remain intact.

Economic system: the author believes that there is a definite role for the government in creating the basic state infrastructure, but that free-market principles should apply for most other economic activities.

Summary

The preceding pages have, the author believes, mapped out the following premises and conclusions:

- That all western nations, America and Canada included, are in serious racial demographic trouble and set to be overrun by Third Worlders within a few decades at most;
- That the chances for halting and reversing this process through any democratic means grow smaller by the day, and in many places, is already impossible;
- That despite this, the policy of participation in public political activities by pro-European activists must continue, even if for the sake of reaching as many Europeans as possible, or for the outside chance that someone, somewhere, might actually win through and take power in a nation;
- That any thought of violent insurrection is doomed to failure;
- That, for assorted ideological and dysgenic reasons, there are large numbers of whites who are either impossible to "save" or who even should be saved; and that these numbers form a majority of Europeans alive today;
- That it is ultimately only possible to "save" a minority of Europeans in the sense of awakening them to the real consequences of modern Western liberalism;
- That given the above circumstances, it is only sensible to explore all other possibilities for survival, and that these possibilities are essentially limited to one or both of the following: (a) the creation of localized communities which can survive the coming racial catastrophe, with the ultimate aim of joining together with other such communities to form a new European state; or

  (b) the quicker idea of moving large numbers of our racially-conscious people to an already existing state with the intention of turning it into a European homeland;

- That this policy can be justified in terms of international law and conventions governing the right to self-determination of all peoples;
- That this policy is the very opposite of racial supremacy of any sort;
- That, going by the two case studies examined, Orania in South Africa and the Zionist state of Israel, any such colonization process must be clinically and methodically planned, and not left to haphazard chance.

Only through the preservation of our people, even if in a core group, can our culture and civilization be preserved. It is possible to achieve this in a manner which does not give offense to others, and which, if phrased correctly, will even draw support from all people of goodwill.

A Noble Goal

A European homeland is a long-term goal, which will take great effort to achieve. Yet the end product—a place which will offer our people peace, security, and identity, is a noble and idealistic goal, worthy of the greatest achievements of our ancestors.

Time and time again we have been able to rise up and meet what appeared to be insurmountable challenges.

Compared to the exploits of Columbus; the Spanish Conquistadors; the sacrifices of the first settlers of America; the Boers of the Great Trek; and the pioneers of New Zealand and Australia; the setting up of local communities, and even a new state, is a minor task. All we need is to decide to do it, and the rest becomes possible.

Aut Viam Inveniam Aut Faciam!
I'll either find a way or make one!

Orania website: http://www.orania.co.za

Project Nova Europa: http://www.projectnovaeuropa.com

Suggested further reading:

Folk and Nation: Ethnonationalism Explained, Arthur Kemp, Ostara Publications, revised edition, 2012.

The French Revolution in San Domingo, T. Lothrop Stoddard, Ostara Publications, 2011 edition.

Race, Professor John Baker, Ostara Publications, 2012 Third Updated edition.

White Identity: Racial Consciousness in the 21st Century, Jared Taylor, New Century Foundation, 2012.

The Rising Tide of Color, T Lothrop Stoddard, Ostara Publications, 2012 edition.